

THE ORIGINS OF
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
S T. M A T T H E W

THE ORIGINS OF
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
ST. MATTHEW

BY
G. D. KILPATRICK

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1946

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4

London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Cape Town Bombay
Calcutta Madras

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

THE study of the New Testament in the period between the two world wars took on new life and developed new methods and interests. This book is in part an attempt to see how far these developments illuminate the origins of our Gospel. In part it is a contribution to the study of the relations between Judaism and early Christianity in an important but neglected period. The savagery to which the Jewish people was subjected in the period in which this book was in writing makes it necessary to say that it was composed *sine studio et ira*. All however who are in any way interested in the rise of Christianity out of Judaism must earnestly desire the return of peace and security to Jewish scholarship from which so much has been learned in the past. It is hoped to follow the chapter 'The Gospel and Judaism' with a study in more detail of the relations between the Church and the Synagogue in A.D. 70-135.

I wish to thank many friends for their interest and encouragement. In particular to Professor R. H. Lightfoot, who gave many valuable hours to a weighty and detailed criticism of the type-script, to Dr. J. W. Parkes, who with his habitual liberality put himself and his library at my disposal, and to Dr. W. D. McHardy, with whom I constantly discussed the work as it proceeded, my gratitude is due. As the book was written in wartime and away from the great theological schools, I was especially dependent on the good offices of librarians. Among them I must thank the Librarian of Dr. Williams' Library and Miss A. M. Worsdell, Librarian of the Woodbrooke Settlement, for patient help readily given over a long time. I thank the National Central Library for multiplying my resources in a way otherwise impossible.

G. D. K.

WISHAW RECTORY,
WARWICKSHIRE
Epiphany, 1946

CORRIGENDA

- p. 26 l. 19 *for* Matt. v. vii, *read* Matt. v-vii,
50 25 ,, Gospels .. Gospel
51 12 ,, Mark vii. 18 .. Mark vii. 28
121 2 ,, Ezod. .. Exod.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES	8
III. THE PECULIAR NARRATIVES	37
IV. THE LITURGICAL BACKGROUND	59
V. THE LITURGICAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPEL	72
VI. THE GOSPEL AND JUDAISM	101
VII. THE COMMUNITY OF THE GOSPEL	124
VIII. THE EVANGELIST	135
IX. CONCLUSION	140
 INDEX	
I. References to the Gospels	143
II. Subject Index	151

ABBREVIATIONS

- A.T.R. *Anglican Theological Review*
E.T. *Expository Times*
J.B.L. *Journal of Biblical Literature*
J.T.S. *Journal of Theological Studies*
Z.N.W. *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

I

INTRODUCTION

Summary. The study of Matthew begins with a consideration of the factors in its composition and with a preliminary survey of the evidence on authorship, date, and place of writing. The factors which contributed to the production of Matthew, the sources, the author, and the circumstances in which it was compiled, have all to be studied for a true picture of its origins. On these origins Papias' information is wholly erroneous. The ascription to St. Matthew was in being *c. A.D. 125*, the Gospel was written *c. A.D. 90–100*, and the author is unknown.

THE first step in any inquiry into the origins of the Gospel is to examine the factors at work in its creation and to make a preliminary survey of the relevant evidence. These two aims cannot be pursued in complete separation from each other. For example, data of the documentary hypothesis which are derived from the study of the elements in the composition of the work have to be compared with external evidence when the question of authorship is being discussed. It is also convenient at this stage to see what conclusions about date and place, as well as authorship, can be used as starting-points in the investigation. They may serve also as valuable guides in the main part of the task.

In this we are concerned with the factors which can be discerned in Matthew. They are not all of equal importance, but none can be neglected if we desire to understand how the Gospel came into being. They are, first the sources of the material contained in the Gospel, secondly the activity and purpose of the evangelist in writing it, and thirdly the circumstances which brought it into being.

About one element in the first, though not a little remains to be discovered, we have much information, thanks to the investigations on which the documentary hypothesis is built. It is, however, because of the progress made in the search for written sources that the temptation is so strong to look on the documentary hypothesis as the key which will open every door and leave nothing in the Gospel unexplained. The discovery, however, that there are limitations to our use of this theory must not blind us to the great assistance it gives in helping to explain the production of the book and in making other lines of investigation both possible and fruitful. We have, incidentally, the task of making our position clear where details of the source analysis of the Gospel are in dispute

and, when necessary, of carrying out detailed investigations in order to reach a probable opinion on obscure points.

Notice must also be taken of unwritten tradition. Here we have to be careful neither to use such tradition as a means of accounting for awkward facts which will not fit in with the main lines of the documentary theory, nor to rule it out of our calculations where the facts seem to call for it.

The second factor, the activity and purpose of the evangelist, has likewise on occasion served as a kind of scapegoat for all that cannot be laid to the charge of the sources. Editorial activity has often been invoked to explain those features in the Gospel which otherwise seem inexplicable. None the less it must be realized that without an evangelist we should not have had the Gospel and that his personality is the determinant of the other components. This means that he was much more than their mechanical focus, a conception which is belied both by the nature of authorship in general and by the differences between the four Gospels. Some of these differences at least must be due to the differences in personality, outlook, and ability between the evangelists themselves, even if others are due to the compilation of the several Gospels in part from various sources and in different contexts.

The third factor in the creation of our book is its context. This has been much explored by Form Criticism under the heading 'Sitz im Leben'. It is at once clear that the context or 'Sitz im Leben' of a new gospel was as important a feature in its production as it was in the shaping and carrying on of unwritten tradition. While we may not say that the Gospel was created by a community, yet it was created in a community and called forth to meet the needs of a community.¹ This will require us to reconstruct something of the context of Christian religion and Church life in which the book came into being. For this reconstruction the Gospel itself will provide much of the evidence, while valuable indications will come from other Christian literature of this period and from Jewish sources with their information on the relations between Jew and Christian in the period between the two wars, A.D. 70-132.

The nature of the theology of the book must also be kept in mind. It must be explored both in its relation to that of the rest of early Christian literature and much more as having a positive and, in some ways, highly developed, dogmatic and moral teaching of its own.

¹ Scott, *The Validity of the Gospel Record*, 56-8.

Before we examine the operation of these factors in detail it is desirable to look for more general indications of the Gospel's date, place, and authorship. These indications are derived from a consideration of the earliest traditions about the book, from the evidence for its use, from established conclusions about its sources, and from internal inferences implied by these conclusions. All these taken together will enable us to reach some initial opinions with which we can roughly locate the book and realize what points seem to require further investigation.

The earliest form of the tradition appears in the quotation from Papias in Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 39): '*Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραῖδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἥρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἔκαστος.*' This notice is but repeated and enlarged in the Patristic literature from Irenaeus onward. Matthew wrote the Logia in Hebrew [be that strictly Hebrew or Aramaic] and translations of varying achievement were known. This statement at once raises certain difficulties.

The first of these lies in the meaning of the term *τὰ λόγια*. From his context it is quite clear that Eusebius took it to mean the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The same is true of Irenaeus. This interpretation seems the most satisfactory one, especially as we know that the Gospel was used by Ignatius some twenty years before Papias wrote. Nor can the ascription *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* be later than Papias' time. Hence the presumption is that Papias by *τὰ λόγια* means our Gospel. Only if this proves improbable will other interpretations be considered.

Another difficulty occurs at once. Our book is not a translation. For the bulk of its material it depends on Greek sources, Mark, and Q, and its compiler used the Greek Bible. To avoid the implications of these two facts, cumbersome hypotheses have been advanced which by their very complications suggest their improbability.

Again, our Gospel is not by Matthew the Apostle. It depends on two or, more probably, three written sources, Mark, Q, M, and in the handling of these sources it shows the features of a later period. The tone and outlook of the Gospel agree with this. It is incredible that an Apostle should, for the greater part of his material, depend on written sources and, where he revises them, betray the outlook of a later period.

These difficulties force us back to our alternative that by *τὰ λόγια* Papias meant some document other than our Gospel. Two main suggestions have been made.

The first is that by *τὰ λόγια* Papias meant the document Q.

On this hypothesis Q was originally written in Aramaic, and later a number of Greek translations of it were made, one of them being used in both our Matthew and Luke. But, if there were several translations of Q, how is it that Matthew and Luke independently used the same one, while of the others there is no sign? Again, it is not surprising that an anonymous document incorporated in both Matthew and Luke should later disappear, but it is surprising that a document, accepted as the work of the Apostle and in sufficiently widespread circulation in the latter part of the first century to be used by these two evangelists, should have disappeared without a trace.¹

There is also an objection suggested by the traditional title *κατὰ Μαρθαῖον*. This ascription, like those of the other three Gospels, is vouched for both by the anti-Marcionite Prologues and a little later by Irenaeus. As this explicit fourfold canon played a part in the Church's reaction to Marcion's Scripture, it cannot be later than A.D. 150. It is also known apparently to Justin and the author of the Gospel of Peter. This suggests that it might have been known to Papias, and the form of his notices favours the inference that he knew of a *κατὰ Μαρθαῖον* and a *κατὰ Μάρκου* at least.

Another interpretation of *τὰ λόγια* is that it was a kind of testimony book. Here we meet with the difficulty that, from the middle of the second century, our Gospel was widely current under its present title *κατὰ Μαρθαῖον* and was certainly in use, with or without that title, from the time of Ignatius, but that Papias, or his informant, was ignorant of this ascription, though he knew of a testimony book current in various translations and claiming to be by the Apostle. On the efforts to advance other evidence of this testimony book it may at once be said that common methods and, to a large extent, common material do not require a common book other than Holy Writ itself. Hence we may say that this period, apart from Papias, shows no knowledge of such a book.

There remains the further doubt whether *τὰ λόγια* can have this meaning. Here, as elsewhere, Bacon's arguments have to be taken into consideration, and it seems clear that the first suggestion of the phrase is not of a testimony book, a presumption which is supported by the way in which the later writers understood the term.²

¹ Cf. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, p. xii, and *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlvi. 182–4.

² Bacon, op. cit., Appended Note ii. The relevant quotations are too small an element of the Gospel to supply it with a title. Nor is it clear how the theory of a testimony book accords with Papias' statement about translation. See further Windisch, *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xx. 159–60, and, for a detailed refutation of the theory, O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel*, 43–54.

The theories that by τὰ λόγια either Q or a testimony book is meant are attempts to account for the title of the Gospel and to save the credit of Papias. The suggestion is that our Gospel incorporated either Q or the testimony book ascribed to the Apostle and in this way acquired the heading κατὰ Μαρθαῖον. We might as well have expected the Gospel to take its title from its basic component Mark, but to this some objections can be seen. The obvious purpose of such a suggestion is to maintain the truth of Papias' statement and to relate it to the documentary hypothesis. It does not, however, help us in the least to meet the difficulties in Papias' tradition on any showing.

If the attempt to maintain the inerrancy of Papias breaks down, some effort must be made to understand the origin of the error. The information that he gives us centres on two points: the first is that the Gospel is in some way the work of the Apostle, and the second is the tradition of translation. The origin of the second point can be understood if we imagine that Papias, or rather his informant, knew of the Gospel as κατὰ Μαρθαῖον and also of the objections to this ascription. To account for the ascription, and to deal with the objections, the hypothesis of translation was introduced: from this results the statement that we have in Papias. This, of course, presupposes that the book was known as κατὰ Μαρθαῖον before Papias wrote and does nothing to explain the ascription. The nature of the objection we can, at the best, only imagine. It may have been first made from some knowledge of how the Gospel came into being. Later, when the force of the objection was still felt, though its grounds were forgotten, the theory of translation was propounded. All this, of course, is mere hypothesis and is not advanced as the explanation of the difficulty, but only to show that an explanation of part of Papias' statement is possible. It must be admitted that, once the suggestion of translation from a Semitic language had been made, it gained immensely in plausibility from the outstandingly Jewish character of the Gospel.¹

This leaves us with the probability that the tradition about authorship, false as it is, came into being c. A.D. 125, and that the Gospel is itself considerably older. It does not explain how κατὰ Μαρθαῖον originated.

We said 'considerably older' than A.D. 125, because the book had to be written, it had to gain currency, the knowledge of its true

¹ Bacon's hypothesis (*op. cit.*, chap. iii), that the ascription is derived from Aramaic targums of Matthew, later claimed as originals, seems to require more than the twenty-five or so years that he allows for this process. Cf. *Anglican Theological Review*, xiii. 323-8, especially 327.

origin had to have been lost, and the title *κατὰ Μαρθᾶν* had to be established by that date. This means that the Gospel could not have been written later than the end of the first century.

This agrees with the evidence of Ignatius. In his epistles, written c. A.D. 115 on his journey to Rome, he employs this Gospel.¹ That the Gospel was known at Antioch and used by its bishop by A.D. 115 confirms the conclusion, derived from Papias' remarks, that the Gospel was written by A.D. 100.

Having reached our *terminus ad quem* we have now to establish a *terminus a quo* if we are to have some idea of the period in which the Gospel was written. This we can arrive at only by studying the evidence of the Gospel itself.

Part of this evidence is supplied by the fact of composition; the Gospel must be later than its sources. One of these we can date approximately. The Gospel according to St. Mark belongs to c. A.D. 65. Some scholars would suggest a date after the fall of Jerusalem. It can hardly be earlier than just before the outbreak of the Jewish war. This means that our Gospel must be dated after A.D. 70, as some time must have elapsed between the composition of Mark and its use in Matthew.

Certain features of the text agree with this. A comparison of Matt. xxii. 1-10 with Luke xiv. 16-24 suggests that the story at Matt. xxii. 7 has been rewritten to make explicit reference to the destruction of Jerusalem.² Before this alteration could be effected it was necessary for the fall of Jerusalem to lead to a change in the interpretation of the passage, and this modified interpretation had to become fixed before it could be written into the text as it is in our Gospel. This seems to require a date after A.D. 75.

This means that the Gospel was produced in the last quarter of the first century. More exact than this we cannot be, though we may point to certain probabilities. The later we put the Gospel after A.D. 100 the harder we make it to explain why it so speedily acquired its designation of *κατὰ Μαρθᾶν* and why it is so free from Pauline influence. On the other hand, the general character of the Gospel is harder to account for the nearer we put it to A.D. 75.³ Further, the hypothesis to be advanced about the way in which the component documents were used in writing our Gospel requires that these documents should have been in use for a considerable period, perhaps some twenty to twenty-five years, before they were incorporated in the book.

¹ For the evidence see *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, 76-81. See too, Bacon, op. cit. 25.

² Bacon, op. cit., 65 f.

³ Bacon, op. cit., chap. v.

We must bear in mind that, despite some recent hypotheses to the contrary, Matthew and Luke, though they agree in both using the same two sources, Mark and Q, appear to have been produced in complete independence of one another. If we put one of them considerably earlier than the other, this makes it harder to account for such independence, while if they are contemporary it is what might be expected. The tendency seems to be to put the Lucan writings not earlier than c. A.D. 80–90.

These probabilities suggest a date about A.D. 90–100. It will be realized, however, that the arguments on which this inference rests are of varying weight in themselves and do not permit of precise conclusions.

The place of origin is equally uncertain. A certain ignorance of Palestinian geography argues against Palestine itself, and the early connexion of the Gospel with Antioch favours that city as a candidate for the honour. The church in which the Gospel was written was Greek-speaking, but strongly Jewish in character and opposed to the aggressive Pharisaic Judaism that was active in this period. That might be true of many churches in the Eastern Mediterranean lands at this time.

About authorship we are still much in the dark. The title has been shown to be false, but it is problem enough at this stage to discover why it was ever given to the book, without trying to discover more positive information. Two points may be considered. The substitution of *Ματθαῖον* in Matt. ix. 9 for *Λευὶν τὸν τοῦ Αλφαῖον* in Mark ii. 14, whatever the original reason for it, was bound to play a part in the provision of an author for the book. Secondly, the existence of other Gospels, *κατὰ Μάρκου*, *κατὰ Λουκᾶν*, *κατὰ Ἰωάννην*, made it increasingly desirable to differentiate our Gospel by a name, and that one of some standing.¹ Whether these two considerations are a sufficient explanation cannot, of course, be decided. In our ignorance of the course of events we cannot expect to know more about the authorship of the book, as distinct from the personality of the evangelist.

¹ The suggestion that at first Matthew was known just as 'The Gospel' seems probable, Bacon, op. cit., 19, with the quotation from Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 500.

II

THE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

Summary. In Chapters II and III the sources of the Gospel are examined, Chapter II being concerned with the written sources, Mark, Q, and M.

Section A gives a survey of the sources. Mark, in the form which has come down to us, was one source for Matthew. Q, another source, cannot be exactly recovered, as the evangelist sometimes follows his sources closely, sometimes conflates or freely rewrites them, and sometimes may be following a peculiar source. Q^{Mt.} and S as distinct sources are rejected.

In Section B the discourse material of Matt. v–xxv is treated in detail, and reasons are found for assuming a third source M. Mark, Q, and M are delimited as far as possible, and finally a sketch of M is given.

SOME conclusions about the sources of the Gospel and the whole synoptic problem have so widely commended themselves and have been so adequately supported by research that they need only be stated here with references to some of the relevant treatments. Others are much more disputed and need more detailed discussion.

A. Mark and Q

The first conclusion is that, like Luke, the evangelist used Mark. Since we have the text of Mark before us, we can learn what method was followed in incorporating sources into the Gospel, as the comparison of the derived text with the original reveals every alteration which the compiler of Matthew made. We can often go beyond this to discover the purpose of the alterations and infer the general outlook behind the purpose.

There is, however, one matter of dispute. Did the evangelist use a copy of Mark identical with our Mark, apart from those textual variations which must have differentiated any two copies of the same work in antiquity? The alternative is that there were two editions of Mark, one which has survived as the canonical Gospel and the other used in compiling Matthew and Luke. The grounds for the second view are two: first, in a number of passages where these two Gospels depend on Mark alone, they agree in details of text against our Mark; secondly, on occasion they both make considerable changes from Mark which it is hard to explain on any other theory. The first argument is the weightier, but apart from examples where these agreements can be explained as coincidences in stylistic correction, investigation has revealed that they are textually questionable, often appearing only in certain groups of

manuscripts.¹ Once the first argument has been found to lack cogency the second fails to maintain itself, especially as, while the changes are on occasion great, the evangelists do not agree against Mark in these changes. For these reasons it will be assumed that the Mark used in compiling Matthew was identical with our Gospel, except for incidental textual variations.

The next source to be distinguished was that known as Q. It is soon discovered from a synopsis that, in addition to what they have taken from Mark, Matthew and Luke often agree not only in substance but also in words and structure. The natural inference is that they are here using a common source other than Mark, a source usually known as Q.

Unfortunately Q, unlike Mark, is not available in a free state. Consequently we cannot at once tell, as we can with Mark, to what extent it has been used by the two evangelists, or how they have treated its wording and substance. This makes it difficult and sometimes impossible to discover what material comes from Q and what does not, with the result that no two reconstructions of Q agree. A certain amount of agreement, however, is possible. Those passages in which there is a measure of verbal and structural as well as substantial agreement between the two Gospels undoubtedly come from Q, and we may take verbal similarity between Matthew and Luke, where it is independent of Mark, as the best criterion of the use of Q.

Besides these passages there are others where substantial similarity is great but verbal similarity is small. There are three ways of accounting for this. The evangelists may have rewritten their source to such an extent that verbal similarity is much reduced or disappears. For examples of this rewriting Matt. xii. 40 may be compared with Luke xi. 30, Matt. vi. 19-21 with Luke xii. 33-4. Illustration from the treatment of Mark may be found at Matt. xix. 9 beside Mark x. 11f. and Matt. xix. 16-19 beside Mark x. 17-19.

On the other hand, the explanation may lie in the fact that the two evangelists were using different sources which overlapped. Such overlapping is to be expected and examples are easy to find.² We know that Mark and Q had parallel and independent accounts of John the Baptist and of the Beelzebub controversy. Luke's special source and Mark may have had parallel sections as perhaps in the Sermon at Nazareth. Mark xiv. 22-5 and 1 Cor. xi. 23-5 relate the same incident but are independent. There must then have been several parallel and independent versions of gospel

¹ Streeter, op. cit., chap xi.

² Streeter, op. cit., 238-46.

material current during the period in which our Gospels were written. Accordingly there is no necessity to assume that parallel passages, where significant verbal agreements are absent or negligible, must have come from the same written source. The difficulty in practice, however, is to distinguish between parallel and independent passages on the one hand, and on the other hand passages which owe their considerable verbal differences to editorial rewriting.

There is also a third explanation. Very often the evangelist conflates his sources. For example, in iii. 1-12 the Marcan and Q accounts of John the Baptist are fused together. Another example may be found at xii. 22-32 beside Mark iii. 22-9 and Luke xi. 14-23. xiii. 31 f., the Parable of the Mustard Seed, beside Mark iv. 30-2 and the Q version Luke xiii. 18 f., shows how this practice of conflation can affect even the smallest details. Some of the differences between Matt. xxii. 1-14 and Luke xiv. 16-24 may be due to this procedure. Besides substantial agreement there is a certain verbal agreement but also great verbal differences. That conflation has taken place is suggested by the fact that xxii. 11-14 requires xxii. 1 f. as its introduction. Otherwise it is a story without beginning and without point.

In view of these facts we must, in our attempt to distinguish the various sources in Matthew, allow for the possibility that the evangelist may be following one of several methods. He may be following one source closely, in which case verbal similarity will be a sufficient guide; he may be conflating, he may be freely rewriting, or he may be using a peculiar source. Sometimes a measure of rewriting and of conflation are to be suspected in the same passage, as in xxii. 1-14, quoted above, where two stories are run together and vv. 6 f. seem to be due to editorial activity. In some sections we have to remain in doubt which method is being used as the evidence is inconclusive, and we cannot be sure whether we are dealing with material from Q or from another source, or with the evangelist's own composition.

There are other difficulties in the search for Q. We know that, beside a few sections of Mark which do not reappear in the other Gospels, there are others which are used only in Matthew or Luke. One consideration suggests that there was little of Q which has not survived at all. The complete disappearance of Q as an independent document can be understood more easily if all or almost all of it was contained in Matthew or Luke or both.¹

¹ *J.T.S.* xlvi. 182-4; cf. p. 4 above.

A second consideration points in the same direction. It has been shown that about eleven-twelfths of Mark have been incorporated in Matthew, and, other things being equal, we should expect about the same proportion of *Q* to have been used in composing the Gospel. Nor does a detailed examination of Matthew suggest that it contains many *Q* passages that have not been employed in Luke also. There are more probably several sections in Luke only, which derive from *Q*. From these probabilities (they are no more) it may be inferred that over and above those elements in the Gospel which have linguistic and substantial agreements with Luke, very little can be assigned to *Q*.

This means that hypotheses such as *Q^{Mt.}* are to be avoided. They are attempts to link up some of the peculiar material in Matthew with material known to derive from *Q*, and cannot be considered plausible until the alternative theory, that in the main peculiar material is derived from peculiar sources, has been disproved. There is a further difficulty. Whatever conclusions may be drawn about the Lucan Passion story, it is clear that in Matthew no continuous narrative is employed other than Mark, and that in the Passion chapters Matthew shows no significant agreements with Luke against Mark. From this it may be deduced that *Q* had no Passion narrative. It is hard, therefore, to imagine that a revised and enlarged edition of *Q*, such as *Q^{Mt.}* is supposed to have been, would have been put forward without this deficiency being made good. But Matthew, as has been stated above, knew only the Marcan Passion as a continuous source. Therefore *Q^{Mt.}* lacked a Passion story and, contrary to expectation, was unrevised in this important respect. If, however, it is suggested that *Q^{Mt.}* was later than Mark and derived its Passion story thence just as it derived the peculiar material from elsewhere, then *Q^{Mt.}* begins to look very like our Matthew and really does not further our inquiry, throwing no light, for example, on the origin of the peculiar material. If this objection is not sustained, there is another objection to the *Q^{Mt.}* hypothesis. In the rest of the subject-matter of *Q*, apart from the Passion, the balance between discourses and narrative is not redressed, a redress that we should expect with any revision or increase of material.

Bussmann has advanced a different theory, to account, among other things, for the varying degrees of resemblance between the common passages in Matthew and Luke.¹ He argues that *Q* is not

¹ Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien*, ii. 110–203, e.g. 137, 188, and *The Expository Times*, xlvi. 72.

one document but two, R, an Aramaic source, and T, a Greek one; T being behind the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke of greater verbal similarity and R behind those of less verbal similarity or only of substantial agreement. This is but an alternative explanation of the facts which, as has been shown above, can be accounted for by what are found on other grounds to be the editor's methods. On this score Bussmann's hypothesis has the disadvantage of introducing additional and unnecessary complications.

Like Bussmann, Bacon¹ protested against treating Q as a single document without qualification. He distinguishes between Q, the category of material verbally common to Matthew and Luke, and the document S which, besides the Q material, included much that was peculiar to Matthew or to Luke, and was used by all three synoptic Gospels.

The protest against identifying category and source was right. We cannot say that, because there are four categories of material in Matthew, that common to all three synoptic Gospels, that appearing in Matthew and Mark, that shared by Matthew and Luke, and that peculiar to Matthew, therefore the evangelist used four documents in compiling the Gospel. It may be that the material which a mechanical analysis would reveal as peculiar to Matthew might show signs of being derived from more than one document or, in part, of not being derived from written sources at all. More than mechanical analysis on the basis of one criterion is needed.

On the other hand, Bacon's theory of a primal S appears contrary to what is revealed by a careful examination of the material and to what we know of the development of our documents. Form criticism suggests that, before its appearance in written sources, our material was current in small units more or less closely grouped together in sections of no great length. At this stage an organic whole like our Gospels, with their long stretches of apparently consecutive narrative and discourse, were quite unknown and not to be expected. In our written sources also the more rudimentary stage seems the earlier. Behind Mark's Passion narrative there may well stand a shorter and simpler document. It is in Mark that the gospel as a new literary form first appears, and in Matthew and Luke this form is elaborated and developed with new purposes in mind. In John there are developments of another kind and yet other aims are involved, while in many of the apocryphal works the gospel form is clearly used as a means of heretical propaganda.

¹ Op. cit., p. xii and chap. vii.

The trend throughout is from the smaller and less organic source to the larger and more organic whole. In this trend Q represents a definite stage. It is not a gospel, but the addition of a Passion narrative represents the one major structural development between it and Mark. S, according to Bacon, was no hole-in-a-corner production, but was used in all three synoptic Gospels, and seems to have been larger and more organic than our Q and possibly than our Mark.

Accordingly we must either accept his theory and jettison the view that there was a definite development in tradition of evangelical material, or, discarding his theory, approve of the usual account of development. The two views are incompatible and all the evidence lies on the side of the hypothesis of development. Hence we may well feel disinclined to treat Q merely as a category and S as a source.

In the last few paragraphs the peculiar matter of the Gospel has come up for discussion and the rejection of such sources as Q^{Mt.} or S has left it still a problem to be dealt with. Some theories have attempted to account for it within the documentary hypothesis by assigning it all to special written sources such as M and N.¹ To explain part of the peculiar elements, the theory of oral tradition has been invoked, while editorial revision, free composition, and similar factors have been advanced to account for others. With such a variety of possibilities, none of which has established itself unreservedly, it is necessary to examine the problem anew in some detail.

In this examination there are difficulties, because we are attempting not merely to separate the peculiar parts of the text, to some degree a mechanical and straightforward operation, but also to determine what is the nature of the source or sources behind this peculiar element. We have also to decide whether it justifies us in the refusal to accept the Q^{Mt.} or S hypotheses. If we decide that the evangelist used one or more peculiar sources it has yet to be settled whether the source in question was in writing or no. Further, the exact limits over against Mark and Q, as well as the editor's handiwork, have to be drawn as far as is possible. Questions of nature, origin, and outlook, as well as the place in the growth of the Gospel, can be discussed only when the former points have been treated.

In putting these two matters to the test, the existence and extent

¹ Cf. Bacon, op. cit., pp. xiii f., 145–64, 499–504, for his use of the symbol N. Under it he would put much of the material discussed below in Chapter III.

of the material derived from a peculiar source or sources on the one hand, and on the other the question whether the source was written or no, though we shall be without the assistance of comparison which is enjoyed in distinguishing Marcan material and even Q, yet we shall have important help from the evidence of language, structure, and order. Sometimes the peculiar material will appear unique; sometimes, especially in conflated passages, it will have substantial parallels in Mark or Luke. On the whole the examination will be a difficult process and conclusions about a number of passages will have to be tentative, while about others no opinion will be possible.

A preliminary definition of the field to be examined must now be made. The peculiar parts of the Gospel may, for this purpose, be divided into two; the one part consists entirely of discourse and is contained in chapters v-xxv; to the other will be assigned all narrative sections, the quotations, and many of the shorter additions to the Marcan stretches of the Gospel.

The study of the two parts diverges considerably. That of the latter presents a number of inquiries rather than one: the origin of the Birth and Resurrection stories, of the peculiar quotations, of the supplements to the Marcan material, all require investigation, but the investigation may well be deferred until after the discourse material has been tested. The reason for this lies in the difference in nature between the two categories of material. The elements of discourse have often been felt to stand on their own feet in a way that the other elements do not. These have been held to be secondary and dependent on their context. The only exception where a measure of independence may be conceded is to be found in the Birth stories.

B. The Examination of Chapters V-XXV

In the treatment of the discourse material the following method will be observed. The various sections into which chapters v-xxv fall will be first examined for peculiar material and next, either immediately following this, or, if the suggestions of grouping and structure require it, at the end of the section, the bearing of the results of our examination on the question of sources will be investigated. Finally will come an attempt to sum up the results of the search.

The first section to be treated is that of the Sermon on the Mount, chapters v-vii. It can, in the main, be treated in isolation, since the peculiar material in it is apparently self-contained. Mark

is used only occasionally, but Q, both the Sermon as in Luke vi. 20-49 and elements drawn from other contexts, has been largely employed.

The introduction, v. 1 f., has very few parallels outside the Gospel. The verbal parallels with Luke vi. 20 are of the slightest. The Q sermon must have had some kind of introduction, perhaps one very like that preserved in Luke vi. 20. In view of the difference of Matt. v. 1 f. from this, we may assume, either that the evangelist has freely rewritten the Q introduction, or else that he has derived one from another source. If the building up of the Sermon comes from him, then it is very probable that he produced the introductory formula as it stands in order to give the Sermon a setting of his own choosing, so as to bring out the ideas and contrasts which he wished to suggest. If the introduction of the mountain was intended to recall Sinai, the evangelist wished to provide a contrast with the lawgiving of Moses, but if this was not his intention, he used a setting from a peculiar source.

In the Beatitudes, vv. 3, 6, 11 f. are clearly from Q. The additions *τῷ πνεύματι*, ver. 3, and *καὶ δύσπιλος τὴν δικαιοσύνην*, ver. 6, are editorial phrases designed to define the meaning more closely.

To ver. 4 there is a substantial parallel in Luke vi. 21, *μακάριοι οἱ κλαύοντες νῦν ὅτι γελάσετε*. Are both versions derived from Q? The evidence for a decision is found partly in language and partly in context and Old Testament background. While it is used nine times in Luke, *κλαίειν* appears but twice in Matthew, ii. 18, a quotation from Jeremiah xxxi. 15, and xxvi. 75 from Mark xiv. 72. The word is found also at Mark v. 38, where Matthew omits it, and v. 39, where he avoids the whole phrase. Luke vii. 32 has *ἐκλαύσετε* but Matt. xi. 17 *ἐκόφασθε*. This indicates that *κλαίειν* was a word which the evangelist sought to avoid. *Γελᾶν* occurs only at Luke vi. 21, 25. The Matthean form may have been rewritten to echo Isaiah lxi. 2, *παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας*. These two facts favour the view that the Beatitude has been taken from Q and rephrased by the evangelist. The corresponding woe in Luke vi. 25, while it suggests that something equivalent existed in Q, in the use of *πενθήσετε* as well as *κλαύσετε*, implies that *πενθεῖν* stood in Q as well as in Matthew. Unfortunately the text of Luke vi. 25 is not certain. Most of the evidence reads *πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε*, but *πενθήσετε καὶ* is omitted by 1424, Irenaeus and Hilary, *καὶ κλαύσετε* by X, 213, vg. (1 ms.), Marcion, Jerome, while *κλαύσετε καὶ πενθήσετε* is read by *r² syr. sin., pesh.*, Tatian. *πενθεῖν* is found nowhere else in the Lucan writings and may be a gloss from Matthew. The

two verbs are conjoined at Jas. iv. 9, Rev. xviii. 11, 15, 19, and Mark xvi. 10. If this is so, then there is no objection to the hypothesis that Matthew has an edited form of the Beatitude which stood in Q in much the same form as it now appears in Luke.

The disturbance of the order of vv. 4, 5 in some manuscripts tells us nothing about the history of ver. 5 before it appeared in the Gospel and is not in itself sufficient evidence for omission. The verse is a quotation of Ps. xxxvi. 11, *οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσοντις γῆν*, which has been adapted to the beatitude form. Verses 7-10 are independent of Q. If Luke vi. 36, *γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἔστων*, is from the same source as Matt. v. 48, to wit Q, and reproduces it more closely, it provides a loose parallel to ver. 7. Clement of Rome¹ has a nearer one, *ἔλεάτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε*. These two versions suggest that in ver. 7, as possibly in ver. 5, the earlier form of the saying was not that of a Beatitude but a simple statement. Verses 8 f. are peculiar to Matthew and in ver. 8 *τῇ καρδίᾳ* may be an editorial addition like *τῷ πνεύματι*, ver. 3. Verse 10 looks like a shorter parallel version to v. 11 f. The use in vv. 10-12 of *διώκειν*, which does not appear in Luke vi. 22 f., may be an editorial touch. The evidence seems to suggest that Matthew has *διώκειν* with the meaning 'persecute' in places where it was originally absent. The word occurs, never in Mark, once in Q, Matt. xxiii. 34, Luke xi. 49, and once in Luke's rewriting of Mark. xiii at xxi. 12. In Luke xvii. 23 the sense is different. In Matthew it occurs six or seven times, vv. 11, 12, 44 in Q contexts, in x. 23 it may occur twice if we follow the reading of D, Θ, f 1, f 13, v. lat., syr. sin., xxiii. 34 from Q and the present passage. This suggests that *διώκειν* is a mark of the evangelist's style and that both *δεδιωγμένοι* here and *διώξωσιν* ver. 11, and *ἐδίωξαν* ver. 12 are from him. *ὅτι αὐτῶν ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* repeats ver. 3, where *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* is typical of the evangelist. *δικαιοσύνη* too belongs to the evangelist's vocabulary. It does not occur in Mark nor apparently in Q, is once only in Luke, but seven times in Matthew. At v. 6, vi. 33 it is intruded into a Q context. It is clear therefore that this Beatitude is not merely peculiar to the Gospel but strikingly Matthean in its style. It is also the one peculiar Beatitude which cannot easily be turned into a single statement by omitting *μακάριοι* and *ὅτι*. Another distinguishing feature will appear below. The strong Matthean style implies either that the saying has been completely rewritten or else that it was first put into writing by the evangelist. This second alternative is favoured by the fact that the Beatitude

¹ ad Cor. xiii. 2.

is distinct in character from the other peculiar Beatitudes. The difficulty on any count is to understand why the evangelist admitted it to his text as well as vv. 11 f.

Our division into Q and non-Q elements is supported by the analysis according to content. Verses 5, 7, 9 are blessings pronounced explicitly on virtues, while in vv. 3 f., 6, 10-12 it is the misfortunes or deficiencies of the righteous which are blessed. The latter group, apart from ver. 10 which is already suspect on other grounds, is derived from Q, while all the verses of the former group are peculiar. Two of this group, vv. 5, 7, were probably current at one time, not as Beatitudes but as simple statements, and it is easy to reduce vv. 8 f. to the same form *οἱ καθαροὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται, οἱ εἰρηνοποιοὶ νιὸν θεοῦ κληθήσονται*. We may infer that the evangelist built up his group of sayings on the basis of Q, assimilating to the beatitude form the simple statements behind vv. 5, 7-9, and adding ver. 10. This means that we cannot talk of a set of Beatitudes in a peculiar source corresponding to the set in Q, but only of some four sayings of which we do not even know whether they formed a group or not.

The next section, vv. 13-16, is likewise conflate. Except for the clause *ὑμεῖς ἔστε τὸ ἀλα τῆς γῆς*, vv. 13, 15 seem to be constructed out of Mark ix. 50, iv. 21, and Q, Luke xiv. 34 f., xi. 33 with viii. 16. The slight peculiarities may be due to rewriting or may have survived from Q where Luke has changed it. There remain the first clause of ver. 13, and vv. 14, 16. Verse 14 seems to consist of two sayings. The first, *ὑμεῖς ἔστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου*, connects immediately with ver. 16. The second appears to be a disconnected saying placed here by the editor. To him we may assign ver. 13, *ὑμεῖς ἔστε τὸ ἀλα τῆς γῆς*, compiled on the analogy of ver. 14 to serve as an introduction to the saying on salt. The peculiar sayings 14, 16, may have been handed down as isolated fragments or in a context now lost to us.

With ver. 17 we enter on a long section that continues to vi. 18, containing much peculiar material. Smaller subsections are distinguishable within it and these will be first examined in order, and afterwards an attempt will be made to reconstruct the history of the whole.

First we must treat vv. 17-20. Here there is little by way of conflation of sources. Verse 18 has a parallel in Luke xvi. 17 and is from Q with a few editorial changes. There remain 17 and 19 f. which do not cohere. The phrase *τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων* as it stands has nothing to which it can refer. This difficulty is not eased if

ver. 17 is placed immediately before ver. 19. There is an exact parallel to the form of the verse in x. 34, where it seems due to the evangelist who has edited a Q saying. For the phrase 'law and prophets' we may compare vii. 12, xi. 13 from Q and xxii. 40. These facts tell us nothing about the context or origin of the verse. The suggestion that ver. 17 at one time stood as an immediate introduction to vv. 21 ff. involves an ironical interpretation for the verse and makes the mention of the Prophets otiose.

A further clue may be found in the intention of the paragraph as a whole. It seems to have been compiled to serve as an introduction to the following contrasts between Jesus' teaching and the ancient law and especially to mitigate the sharpness of these contrasts. Hence ver. 19 appears in a setting to which it does not really belong and in which it acquires a new meaning, and in so doing sets the meaning for the whole paragraph. Verse 17, as we have seen, is not a natural introduction to 21 and the reference to the Law and the Prophets as a whole suggests that it belonged not to a discussion of particular legal rulings but to a more general issue. Altogether the paragraph is an interesting example of how the editor, by creating new contexts for them, gives a new meaning and reference to sayings in the material before him. This re-creation of contexts we shall find to be quite as characteristic of the Gospel as conflation and rewriting.

Our analysis of the paragraph has broken it up into three disconnected units, none of which seems to belong originally to this context. Verse 18 is derived from Q, but vv. 17, 19 f. are peculiar, and give no indications of their origin.

The origin of the next section, vv. 21–6, is not so obscure and complicated. Verses 25 f. are from Q, parallel to Luke xii. 57–9 and the rest is peculiar. Here it seems that vv. 21 f. and 23 f. owe their juxtaposition to the editor. The rhythmic structure of vv. 21 f. is not carried on in 23 f. and these two verses have no immediate connexion with the revision of the commandment. In ver. 22 *μωρέ* seems to be a gloss on *ῥακά* and *συνεδρίω* on *κρίσει*, so that the verse at one time, before it was taken into the Gospel, may have run somewhat in this manner: ἐγώ δὲ . . . *ῥακά*, *ἔνοχος* *ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός*.¹ Verses 23 f. belong to another context now lost.

Verses 27–30 are from two sources. 27 f. form the second anti-thesis while 29 f. come from Mark ix. 43 ff. Verse 30, which comes first in Mark, here comes second. It is also irrelevant in this context, as sin of the eye alone is mentioned. Accordingly it may well

¹ Cf. E.T., I. 189 f.

be right to omit the verse with D, 59, 238, 243, *d*, *v.g.* (1 ms.), *syr. sin.*, *boh.* (1 ms.), *sah.* (1 ms.). Some of the differences between Mark ix. 47 and Matt. v. 29 can be shown to be in keeping with the characteristics of Matthean style. *δέξιος* (Matthew 11 times, Mark and Luke 6) occurs at Matt. v. 39 in a Q context, but not in the parallel, Luke vi. 29, and at xxvii. 29 in a phrase introduced into a Marcan passage. It accords with the Jewish colouring of Matthew.¹ *συμφέρειν* is found 3 times in Matthew but never in the other synoptic Gospels. At xviii. 6 it is intruded into a saying from Mark. The expression at Mark ix. 47, *καλόν ἐστιν*, appears 7 times in Mark, but in Matthew only 4 times for certain, all reproducing Mark. At Matt. xv. 26 we should probably read *ἔξεστιν* with D *a b c d ff¹ ff² g¹ r¹*, *syr. sin.*, *cur.*, Orig., Hil., Basil., Amb., Ambrst., Hier. (Clem. Hom.), *ἔξεῖναι* coming in Matthew 9 times, Mark 6, Luke 5. So we may put the substitution of *συμφέρει* for *καλόν ἐστιν* to the account of Matthean style. Matthew and Luke have *σῶμα* 13 times, Mark 3 or 4 according as we read at Mark xv. 43 *σῶμα* or, with D *k*, *syr. sin.*, *geog. I.*, *πτῶμα*. If Matt. xxvii. 59a corresponds to Mark. xv. 45b then in Matthew *σῶμα* has been substituted for *πτῶμα*. On *βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ* it may be noted that Matthew prefers *ἀπό* and Mark *ἐκ*. The figures are Matthew *ἀπό* 111, *ἐκ* 81, Mark *ἀπό* 47, *ἐκ* 76. *εἰ* is slightly more frequent in Matthew (Matthew *ἔάν* 31 *εἰ* 34, Mark *ἔάν* 16 *εἰ* 13). *ἔάν* for *ἄν* is left out of the count. Proportionately *ἀπολλύναι* occurs a little more often in Matthew than in Mark (Matthew 18, Mark 10). On the other hand, Mark has considerably more examples of *ἴνα* than Matthew, though at Matt. xxvi. 4, 16 *ἴνα* is inserted in a Marcan context. *ἔξαιρεν* appears here and xviii. 9 and *μέλος* here only in the Gospels. Nothing can be made of such words as *βάλλειν* and *δῆλος*. Are two rare words, *ἔξαιρεν* and *μέλος*, together with the general rearrangement of clauses, enough in themselves to indicate the use of a source other than Mark? The possibility of such a use must be admitted, but probabilities seem against it. So much in the differences between the two Gospels can be assigned to the author of Matthew that we need no recourse to the theory of another source. Verse 31 f. are based on Q (Luke xvi. 18) while the Old Testament quotation and the phrase *παρεκτός λόγου πορνίας* are from the editor.

Verses 33–7 are peculiar to Matthew.² 34 has a parallel in xxiii. 22 and 37a in Jas. v. 12, 2 Cor. i. 17. We have found that the first antithesis, as well as the second, was originally confined to two verses and is rhythmic in structure. This section is much longer

¹ Cf. p. 101, below.

² There is a general parallel at *Sscr. Enoch* xlix. 1.

and it seems probable that it has been considerably expanded. It has been thought that two sayings have been run together, one on vows and the other on oaths. Investigation, however, shows that the clause ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου must mean 'but thou shalt take thine oaths to the Lord'. There is no evidence that ὅρκος can mean the same as εὐχή and ἀποδιδόναι ὅρκον is used in the sense of 'take an oath, swear'.¹ For the general sense reference may be made to Ps. l. 14 and the section throughout deals with the swearing of oaths. This disposes of the attempt to reduce the size of the passage by distinguishing between matter dealing with oaths and matter dealing with vows. It does not, however, dispose of the suspicion that the section has been expanded. If 34 b-6 are omitted, there is left a saying of approximately the same size as that of the other antitheses. In substance 34 b-6 show a certain likeness to xxiii. 16-22 and echo Old Testament passages, 34 b-5 a recalling Isa. lxvi. 1 and 35 b Ps. xlvi. 2. This, however, throws no light on the immediate origin of the clauses. The remaining verses, 33, 34 a, 37, would provide a saying nearer in size to what seems to be the original form of the other antitheses.

The section vv. 38-42 comes in part from Q, but that, except for 38 and 41, the saying is wholly from this source is not so certain as is sometimes thought. The first half of ver. 39, *κριθῆναι* in ver. 40, and ver. 41 have no parallel in Luke. This suggests that two versions have been conflated, one from Q, much as we have it in Luke vi. 29 f., and another known to this Gospel alone. This second version apparently emphasized not the rejection of resistance to violence, but the abstention from lawsuits even to the extent of suffering wrong unjustly. This is the point of *κριθῆναι* and *ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ* will refer to proceedings in court. The sense of the peculiar saying will be as follows: far from observing the *lex talionis* you will refrain from lawsuits altogether, even if it mean suffering injustice. If this reconstruction is plausible, we cannot be certain of the length of the peculiar version.

Verses 43-8 are derived from Q; cf. Luke vi. 27 f., 32-6. There are a number of differences between the two Gospels, but these do not imply the use of more than one source, being all explicable as due to editorial rewriting.

Of vi. 1-18, vv. 9-13 are from Q and 14 f. from Mark. The rest appears in Matthew alone and shows a coherent structure. It falls into the following sections: ver. 1 an introduction on righteousness, vv. 2-4 on almsgiving, vv. 5-8 on prayer, vv. 16-18 on fasting.

¹ Demosth. xix. 318; Aeschin. iii. 74; Dit. Syll.³ 150, 15; Ox. Pap. 1026, 1. 6.

Within vv. 1–8, ver. 7 f. were probably originally a separate saying. At what stage they were added to their present context is uncertain, but there is no reason for suspecting another hand at work here than the editor's.

The following features of the Lord's prayer have no parallel in Luke xi. 2–4: ver. 9 ἡμῶν . . . οὐρανοῖς, ver. 10 γενηθήτω . . . γῆς, and ver. 13 ἀλλὰ . . . πονηροῦ. Is their presence due to the editor's original composition or did he derive them from another source, for example, a different version of the prayer? The first phrase is in the Matthean style, δὲ πατὴρ ὑμῶν δὲ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς or similar words being common in the Gospel. In the second addition it is to be noticed that while heaven and earth are associated twice in Mark at xiii. 27, 31, once or twice in Q, Matt. v. 18 parallel to Luke xvi. 17, Matt. xi. 25 parallel to Luke x. 21,¹ and five times in Luke, in Matthew they are associated thirteen times, Matt. v. 34 f., vi. 19 f., xvi. 19 (2), xviii. 18 (2), 19, xxiii. 9, xxiv. 35, xxviii. 18, the two Q passages, and here. It has been plausibly suggested that the phrase goes with all three preceding clauses and not with the last only. If this is true it is unlikely that the peculiar element in the verse originally stood alone. The phrase γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου recurs at xxvi. 42, an editorial addition in a Marcan context. θέλημα is not certainly found in Q, appears once in Mark, iii. 35, four times in Luke, xxii. 42 alone being of God's will, and six times in Matthew, five of them referring to God's will.

The last clause, ἀλλὰ ρύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, is unique in the Gospels. ρύσθαι is not a common word, occurring again at xxvii. 43, a quotation in a Marcan context from Ps. xxii. 8, and at Luke i. 74 in the Benedictus and elsewhere only in the Epistles. πονηρός is a Matthean word. Twice in Mark, it occurs eight times in Q, eleven times in Luke, and twenty-four in Matthew. It is due to the evangelist at ix. 4, xii. 34, and possibly at xii. 45, xiii. 19, 38, 49, xxii. 10. The clause implies and depends on the previous clause, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν πειρασμόν, which is from Q. The first addition is even more dependent on the Q element and we have seen that the second may well be. Apart from Q the additions are almost meaningless fragments whose context has been lost. They all have Jewish parallels. The evidence of style and context seems to be strongly in favour of the view that the elements which do not derive from Q were composed by the evangelist.

From vi. 19 onward we have a collection which is based mainly

¹ Here, however, καὶ τῆς γῆς is omitted in Luke by $\ddot{\text{P}}^{45}$, Marcion, and is probably an harmonistic insertion.

on Q. Matt. vi. 34, vii. 6, 12 b, 15 have nothing corresponding in Luke. In many of the remaining verses the resemblance to the Lucan passage is more marked in substance than in style. As far as a decision is possible, it has to be decided how far this fact is due to conflation and how far to editorial activity.

The question has been raised about vi. 19–21. Verse 21 is undoubtedly Q. In vv. 19–20 the difference lies in phrase and rhythmic structure. Both differences may have come from the editor or from the use of another source than Q. An examination of vocabulary shows peculiar elements in Matthew and in Luke. *θησαυρίζειν* occurs in Luke xii. 21 (omitted by D, *a*, *b*) and thrice in St. Paul, *θησαυροί* Matt. ii. 11 and here, twice in the Epistles, *θησαυρός* vi. 21, xii. 35 (2, once Q), xiii. 44, 52, xix. 21 (Mark), Mark x. 21, Luke vi. 45 (Q), xii. 33, 34 (Q). *βρῶσις* in the sense of corruption is here only. *ἀφανίζειν* is also at vi. 16, and Acts xiii. 41 in a quotation. *διορύσσειν* comes in xxiv. 43 parallel to Luke xii. 39, a Q passage. *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην* is a Lucan phrase, Luke xi. 41, while in Matt. vi. 2 f. we have *ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην*. *βαλλάντιον* is peculiar to Luke, while Mark, Luke, Matthew, and possibly Q use *πύρα*. *παλαιοῦν* is found elsewhere only in Heb. i. 11, viii. 13 though *παλαιός* is common. *πωλεῖν* is a word used by Q and all the synoptic Gospels, while at Matt. xix. 21 *πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* occurs in a Marcan context. While our evangelist retains *ἔγγιζειν* in the three Marcan passages in which it occurs and uses it four times elsewhere, twice in Marcan contexts, he never has it in Q contexts. In Luke and Acts it occurs twenty-four times against seventeen times in the rest of the New Testament. This suggests that *ἔγγιζειν* in Luke is editorial. *διαφθείρειν* is in Luke xii. 33 in the Gospels. The Matthean juxtaposition of heaven and earth reappears and the parallelism between ver. 19 and ver. 20 is in the manner of the evangelist. Accordingly it seems that editorial activity has been at work in both the Gospels and both versions could be accounted for if the form of the saying in Q were somewhat as follows: *ποιήσατε ἔαντοῦς* (or *ὑμῶν*) *θησαυρὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* *ὅπου κλέπτης οὐ διορύσσει οὐδὲ σῆς ἀφανίζει* (or *διαφθείρει*). This relieves us of the need to assume that two sources have been used to produce the Matthean version.

There is a similar problem at vii. 13 f. compared with Luke xiii. 23 f. Except for *ἀλίγοι* there is nothing parallel to Matthew in Luke xiii. 23, which is the Lucan introduction to the saying. The evidence of vocabulary gives little light. *ἀγωνίζεσθαι* recurs in the Gospels only at John xviii. 36; *θύρα* in Q, Matt. xxv. 10

parallel to Luke xiii. 25; *πόλη* at xvi. 18, Luke vii. 12, and four times in Acts. It is much easier to find a gate than a door. *ἰσχέων* is in all three synoptic Gospels but not certainly in Q. *ἀπάλεια* is to be found at xxvi. 8 from Mark xiv. 4, John xvii. 12, and Acts viii. 20. *εὑρύχωρος* and *πλατύς* do not appear elsewhere in the New Testament. *ἀπάγειν* in the sense of 'lead', not of 'arrest', is also at Luke xiii. 15. *θλίβειν* is at Mark iii. 9 but *τεθλυμμένη* here only. *ζωή* in the meaning *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* is found at xviii. 8 f. from Mark ix. 43, 45, Acts xi. 18 and frequently in John, but not in Luke. Further, while the Lucan form of the saying, like Mark x. 24 f., refers to the difficulty of salvation, in Matthew there is introduced the contrast of the two ways, a commonplace of Jewish and Greek ethical thinking. Nor is this contrast affected by textual variation. The second *ἡ πόλη* in ver. 13 is omitted by Ι 355 *a, b, c, h, k, m, vg.* (2 mss.), Clem., Orig., Hipp., Eus., Tert., Cyp. and in ver. 14 by ΙΙ 3, 182, 482, 544, *a, h, k, m*, and the same Fathers as omit in ver. 13. If we retain *ἡ πόλη*, the contrast of the Two Ways becomes a contrast of the Two Gates as well, while if we omit the words, the contrast of the Two Ways remains and constitutes a difference in substance between Matthew and Luke over and above their verbal differences. The verbal differences make possible the view that the evangelist has employed two sources, but the presence of a substantial difference gives this view greater probability. The rhythmic structure of the saying in Matthew differs from the Lucan form of the saying and this fact may support the suggestion that two sources have been conflated. We may, accordingly, assume that the evangelist has used both the Q saying much as it appears in Luke and also a saying about the Two Ways from another source.

To vii. 21-3 there are parallels at Luke vi. 46, xiii. 26 f. and Matt. xxv. 11-13. But the form and words differ. Verbal contacts are very few. Verse 21 is largely made up of stock Matthean phrases. For *ἔλεύσεται . . . οὐρανῶν* compare v. 20, xviii. 3, xix. 23, and for *δὲ ποιῶν . . . οὐρανοῖς* xii. 50, xxi. 31. Of the little that remains in ver. 21 *κύριε, κύριε* occurs in Luke also. Hence the differences in this verse from Luke may be due to the editor, who may also be responsible for the more sharply antithetic form of the clauses in Matthew. In ver. 22 the resemblances are fewer. *ἔροῦσιν* may come from the source, as Luke xiii. 27 has *ἔρειν*. *κύριε, κύριε* again appears. The substance is not the same and here we have two possibilities. The first is that one of the two evangelists is using another source, while the second is that in one Gospel the saying has been

rewritten. In Luke the speakers refer to events happening in Jesus' own lifetime. In Matthew this contemporary reference is lacking and instead we read of prophecies, exorcisms, and other mighty acts done *τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι*. The evangelist several times attacks false prophets, for example, at xxiv. 11. Verse 23 corresponds substantially with Luke xiii. 27 but verbal agreements are slight. At Luke xiii. 27 *ὑμᾶς* is omitted by B, L, R, 070, 157, 346, 1241, b, ff², i, l. If this omission is accepted, the first half of Matt. vii. 23 is a little nearer Luke xiii. 25. *ὁμολογεῖν* occurs twice in Q and Luke and four times in Matthew. Once, at Matt. xiv. 7, is it intruded into a Marcan context, a fact which suggests that it is characteristic of the evangelist. *οὐδέποτε* appears twice in Mark and Luke, but five times in Matthew, at xxvi. 33 being introduced into a passage from Mark. In Luke the first half of the quotation from Ps. vi. 9 follows the LXX while the second half is differently worded, but in Matthew the opposite is true, *ἀποχωρεῖτε* being read instead of *ἀποστῆτε* of Luke and the LXX. If the quotation originally ran *ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐρύάται ἀδικίας*, the variations between Matthew and Luke could be explained by assuming that the evangelists had each assimilated a different part of the quotation to the LXX. *ἀνομία* occurs four times in Matthew but in none of the other Gospels. Despite the considerable differences between the two passages it seems unnecessary to infer that in Matthew two sources were employed, there being grounds for thinking that the divergence in the two versions of the saying is due to editorial activity, especially in the Matthean form.

Having attempted to sift out the peculiar elements in Matt. v-vii, we must now review our findings.¹ In particular we have to attempt to discover the nature of the source from which these peculiar elements were derived. We may group our material as follows:

- (a) v. 17, 19 f., 21-4, 27 f., 33-7, 38-41 in part.
- (b) vi. 1-8, 16-18.
- (c) v. 5 (?), 7-9, 10 (?), 14, 16, vi. 34, vii. 6, 13 f. in part, 15.

In (a) and (b) there are important groups of peculiar sections displaying a sequence and framework which is not derived from Mark, nor, as far as we can tell, from Q, nor the editor, though the editor has expanded these sections with Marcan and Q elements. It is the orderly form and structure which suggests that the sayings

¹ Cf. Perry, 'The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 103-15. As can be seen, I agree with most of Professor Perry's conclusions, but not, for example, with his treatment of the Beatitudes.

in question are derived from a written source. For such structure would be much more difficult to preserve over fifty or sixty years by oral transmission than in writing. Had it been handed down orally we should have expected it to have been broken up and disintegrated much earlier. This argument is strengthened by the fact that the structure of the sections is fundamentally rhythmic, a characteristic which a written tradition would hardly create, though it might preserve it undamaged enough to be detected. It is, however, maintained over too long a period to survive in this way in oral transmission.

The editorial activity of the evangelist points to the same conclusion. When he rewrites his source, the old and the new can both sometimes be discerned. An example of the editor's style is to be found in the phrases *ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* at v. 19 f. and elsewhere, *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος* at v. 48, cf. v. 16, and probably in the Beatitudes v. 3, 10–12. His activity may also be traced at vi. 19–21, vii. 21–3, where he is using Q. As the editorial style can be traced both in Q and non-Q passages, it is reasonable to infer that the editor is working on material in a fixed form as much in the non-Q passages as in those from Q. This is supported by the history of v. 22. Here, as we have seen, *συνεδρία* is a gloss on *κρίσει* and *μωρέ* on *ῥακά*. The incorporation of the glosses into the saying is much more comprehensible, if the saying was before the evangelist in a written form. At v. 38–42, as at vii. 13 f., we have seen reasons for believing that two sources have been conflated. It is much easier to imagine the conflation of two written sources than of one in writing with another in oral tradition.

In view of these arguments we may assume that behind v. 17–vi. 18 lies a written source other than Mark or Q. This source has been edited by the evangelist and enlarged by him from his other two sources. It is also possible that he has attached to this section some peculiar material which originally belonged to other contexts. The evangelist employs this device in dealing with Mark and Q. For example, the Q material in the Sermon is drawn both from the Q sermon and from other Q contexts. It may well be that similar examples of transposition are to be found in the peculiar material at v. 23 f., 34 f., vi. 7 f.

One such transposition of material is perhaps to be discovered within v. 17–vi. 18. As we have seen, v. 19 f. are not in place where they stand. *δικαιοσύνη*, however, in v. 20 would be admirably taken up by *τὴν δικαιοσύνην* in vi. 1, while in v. 19 *τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων* would, if it originally stood after v. 41, point to the previous

revised commandments, v. 21, 27, 33, and 38. If in our peculiar source the order ran v. 41, v. 19 f., vi. 1-6, we should no longer have to understand v. 19 f. as referring to the Law, a reference which has always proved a difficulty.

With this transposition we may tentatively suggest the following as constituting the core of the peculiar document behind v. 17-vi. 18: v. 17 (?), 21 f., 27 f., 33-34 a, 37, 38-41 in part, v. 19 f., vi. 1-6, 16-18. This particular reconstruction does not affect the general hypothesis that in the Sermon the evangelist, besides Mark and Q, used a third source which may be called M. Once the theory of a third source has been admitted to be the most probable explanation of some of the features of the Sermon, we can with more confidence assume its existence in other contexts where an independent proof would be much more difficult to supply. Granted, however, the existence of M, it is reasonable to assume that it is the source of the peculiar material unless there are grave difficulties against this or another more plausible hypothesis is forthcoming.

We can apply this opinion at once to (c), the third section of the peculiar material of Matt. v. vii, in which we may now include v. 23 f., 34 b-36, vi. 7 f. Some of the arguments which we have used to support the hypothesis of editorial activity can be illustrated from section (c). The evangelist has probably been active in producing the form of beatitude in v. 4 f., 7-9. At vii. 13 f. we have seen strong reasons for thinking that he has conflated two sources. v. 16 displays one of the evangelist's phrases, *τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. We may accordingly conclude that the miscellaneous verses of this third section likewise belong to M, though we cannot point to their order and context in it.

In Matt. x the problem is the same as in v-vii, but on a much smaller scale, as the peculiar element provides a lesser proportion of the whole. Verses 5 f. are only in Matthew. In ver. 6 the phrase, *τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ*, is repeated in a Marcan context at xv. 24, where it cannot be in its original setting. Verses 8 b, δωρεάν ἐλάβετε δωρέαν δότε, 16 b, 23, 25 b, 41 are peculiar to Matthew. To vv. 24-25 a there is so close a parallel in Luke vi. 40 that we may infer that both evangelists are using Q. On the other hand the phrases οὐδὲ δοῦλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ and καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ have no equivalent in Luke. This suggests that the evangelist is conflating two forms of the saying, one, referring to disciple and teacher, from Q, and the other, referring to servant and master, peculiar to Matthew. Verse 40 does not differ enough from Mark ix. 37 to justify the view that the evangelist is using

another source besides Mark. We may assign the following verses to the peculiar source: 5 f., 8b, 16b, 23, 24–5a in part, 25b, and 41. It is clear that these verses are not consecutive though they are all relevant to a missionary charge. There is no framework to be detected as there was in v. 17–vi. 18. Accordingly we cannot tell whether M had, like Q and Mark, a charge to the disciples, or not. The conflation of vv. 24–5a and the echo in xv. 24 of ver. 6 suggest that a written source was used.

The peculiar material in Matt. xi–xii consists of fragments. To xi. 14 there is no parallel in Mark or Luke, but the verse may be the work of the evangelist. There is nothing distinctive in its style, but it is, at least in its present form, wholly dependent on its context. Verses 28–30 appear only in Matthew. Many attempts have been made to assign the passage to Q. The supposition is not necessary, as vv. 25–7, which are from Q, can stand alone. There is nothing corresponding to vv. 28–30 in Luke and no reason has been produced to show why Luke should have omitted the verses. There is a change in subject matter between vv. 25–7 and vv. 28–30 and no necessary connexion joining the two passages together. xii. 5–7 are peculiar. The quotation in ver. 7 has already appeared at ix. 13. Verses 11–12a (down to *προβάτον*) provide a similar saying to those at Luke xiii. 15 f., xiv. 5. At first sight it seems to be from a different source and to belong to M. When, however, the wording is examined and compared with Luke xiv. 5, a different conclusion seems possible. The beginning of ver. 11 resembles Matt. vii. 9, where the introductory phrase differs from that in the Q parallel, Luke xi. 11. This suggests that in either Matthew or Luke the wording has been changed at both places. *πρόβατον* is far commoner in Matthew, the figures being Matthew 11, Mark and Luke 2. In Luke xiv. 5 *ῆμέρα τοῦ σαββάτου, βοῦς* (Luke xiii. 16, xiv. 19), *ἀνασπᾶν* (Acts xi. 10), recur in the New Testament only in the Lucan writings. *βόθυνος* appears again in Q, Matt. xv. 14, Luke vi. 39, but *φρέαρ* only in John and Revelation. These features of style show that most of the differences between Matt. xii. 11 f. and Luke xiv. 5 can be attributed to one or other of the two evangelists, and make it at least possible for the saying to come from Q. This conclusion is the more probable though it cannot be proved. The Rabbinical parallels in Strack-Billerbeck (i. 629 f.) throw no light on the relation here between Matthew and Luke. Verses 36 f. are without parallel. The list of peculiar material in these two chapters is as follows: xi. 14 (?), 28–30, xii. 5–7, 36 f. These verses are fragments whose original context and order are unknown to us.

Likewise there is nothing to indicate if they have undergone any editorial rewriting.

In Matt. xiii, vv. 24–30, 36–52 are peculiar. Two of the parables in these collections have explanations attached, the Parable of the Tares in vv. 36–43 and that of the Drag-net in ver. 49f. It is assumed that these explanations are later than the parables. They can have been so rigidly fixed as to admit of being written down and accepted as coeval with the parables themselves, only if the parables had been long in use in a fixed form. This suggests that they were in writing. If two at least of the four peculiar parables of this chapter were in writing, it may well be that the evangelist drew on a written collection. The consideration of this probability will be undertaken when the parables which occur only in Matthew have all been reviewed.

It has been argued that xiii. 24–30 is a revised version of Mark iv. 26–9 which otherwise is not used in either Matthew or Luke.¹ But in subject-matter, and even more in language, the Marcan and the Matthean parables are independent. It seems more likely that, instead of the somewhat obscure parable in Mark, the evangelist has substituted another with some general similarities. This conclusion is supported by the suggestion above that the explanation of the parable requires that the parable itself should have been before the editor very much in the form in which he has inserted it in the Gospel.

In Matt. xiv–xvii there is little that is not taken from Mark or Q. xv. 12–14a is peculiar, but how much of the passage is due to the source and how much to the evangelist's attempt to fit the saying to the context is uncertain. Behind xvi. 19 lies a saying which probably is found in its more original form at xviii. 18, and is parallel to John xx. 23.

Matt. xviii. 10–14 have frequently been assigned to M.² Verse 10 is peculiar and ver. 11 is an interpolation from Luke xix. 10. The parallel to vv. 12–14 is Luke xv. 3–7 which is fuller than the Matthean version. From the editor's treatment of Mark we know that he frequently abbreviates his source. Some evidence about editorial activity can be derived from the vocabulary of the two versions. *πλανᾶν* occurs four times in Mark and once only does Luke take it over, at xxi. 8. On the other occasions, though he uses the context he avoids the word, which occurs nowhere else in his Gospel. It appears eight times in Matthew. On four of these occa-

¹ Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*², ii. 209.

² Streeter, op. cit., 243–5; B. T. D. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 48, 188–90.

of the saying make it easy to accept the view that the differences between the Gospels are due to revision in both. Streeter¹ held Harnack's suggestion, that Luke xv. 7 was editorial, to be impossible and went on to argue that Matthew and Luke must here be dependent on different sources. We have seen, however, that Matt. xviii. 14 was probably rewritten and this fact admits the possibility that Luke xv. 7 may represent in the main the saying as it was in Q. Further, Matt. xviii. 13 shows traces of the phraseology of Luke xv. 7 in *λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι χαίρει* and *ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐνεργοῦτα ἐννέα*. We may conclude from this that there is no need to assume that in Matthew any other source was used than Q.

The next section, xviii. 15–22, is apparently expanded from a Q saying found in Luke xvii. 3 f. Verse 18 is derived from another source, as are ver. 19 f., which seem to go together. Verse 16 f. depend on the Q saying and seem to refer to the conditions of a later period. The mention of Peter in ver. 21 relates the passage to the Peter stories of the Gospel, with which it will be discussed.

The parable, xviii. 23–35, is peculiar to Matthew. Verse 35 is an interpretative addition which is apparently derived from Mark xi. 25.

Matt. xviii provides, according to the preceding analysis, the following peculiar material: vv. 10, 18, 19 f., 23–34. These verses do not form a coherent section.

In Matt. xix–xxi there is a number of disconnected sayings. xix. 10–12 is peculiar. In its present position it depends on a Marcan context, but probably goes back to an independent source which

¹ Streeter, op. cit. 244 f.

has been adapted to its present position. Streeter¹ argued that throughout xix. 3–12 there are traces both of Mark and of M, but it is noteworthy that editorial activity in Matthew often gives a more Jewish cast to the material than it originally had. xx. 1–16 occurs only in Matthew. Verse 16, however, is taken from Mark x. 31. xxi. 28–31 has no parallels in the other Gospels. The textual variants are interesting but do not affect this conclusion. To ver. 32, Luke vii. 29 f. loosely correspond. It may be an accident that the beginning of the verse ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης repeats the beginning of xi. 18. Otherwise the similarity, such as it is, with viii. 11 f., xi. 18 f. is wholly in substance. Remembering how, on occasion, the sources of the Gospels overlap, we need feel no difficulty in assigning this verse to M along with the rest of the passage. Verse 43 is best explained as due to the evangelist.

xxii. 1–14 appears to be conflated out of two parables with editorial additions. The Q parable may be taken to be given in Luke xiv. 15–24. If ver. 2, ver. 10 καὶ ἐπλήσθη δ νυμφῶν ἀνακειμένων, and vv. 11–14 are taken together, we have a second parable which seems to have existed also in Rabbinical tradition.² This view that two parables have been run together³ would agree with the use of the plural in ver. 1, παραβολᾶς, but is not necessitated by it. Further, vv. 11–14 fit on to vv. 2–10 badly as they stand, but with the introduction given by ver. 2 and the last clause of ver. 10 give us a coherent story. Verse 6 f. have been rewritten to introduce a reference to the fall of Jerusalem. The parable which is not from Q may well be assigned to M.

The collection of woes in Matt. xxiii, besides elements from Q and Mark, contains the following peculiar verses: 2 f., 5, 7b–10, 15–22, 24, 27 f. The source of ver. 26 is not so certain. Its difference from Luke xi. 41 seems to rest on an independent recourse to the Aramaic, Matthew having the correct translation and Luke a mistaken one.⁴ Luke's source here is apparently Q, and as we have every reason to think that Q was in Greek, the error must have been in Q also. Therefore, as Matthew has the correct version, it must have been derived from another source than Q. This conclusion is supported by two other facts. Between Matt. xxiii. 26 and Luke xi. 40 f. there are hardly any verbal contacts and ver. 26, unlike ver. 25 and the Lucan version, addresses one Pharisee. The most probable view accordingly seems to be that the evangelist has compiled his version from two sources, taking ver. 25 from Q and

¹ Op. cit. 259.

² Bacon, op. cit. 72.

³ Streeter, op. cit. 243, n. 2.

⁴ Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*,² 27.

ver. 26 from M. A like doubt may exist about vv. 29–32. Here vv. 30, 32 are peculiar, ver. 29 has verbal agreements with Luke xi. 47, while ver. 31 has a certain community of substance with Luke xi. 48. This suggests that the saying also has been built up from two sources, M and Q, Q probably supplying vv. 29, 31. The second half of ver. 34 only repeats x. 17, 23 with a reference to crucifixion in addition. It probably derives from the editor.

Next comes the inquiry into the nature of the source of the peculiar element in the chapter. Verses 2 f., 5, 7b–10 connect well together. There is a break between ver. 10 and ver. 15, but the later verses from 15 onward could easily belong to a continuous source. The source of the introductory formula, *οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῦσ καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκρίται*, is uncertain. Luke has *οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαῖοις* xi. 42 and *οὐαὶ τοῖς νομικοῖς* xi. 52. It is possible that the evangelist has constructed his formula out of these two formulae in Q and that originally vv. 15–22, 28, 30, 32 were statements in the third person in the same way as vv. 2 f., 5, 7b–10. The example of the Beatitudes shows that the evangelist can, on occasion, assimilate his material to a form derived from Q. At xxiii. 13, 23, 27, 29 instead of the shorter formula of Luke's version we have in Matthew the longer formula. It seems probable that in these cases the Lucan form is the nearer the original. This means that at vv. 13, 23 at any rate (the presence of conflation at v. 25 f., 27 f. affects the argument there) the evangelist may have substituted his formula for that in Q. On the other hand, if the address in the second person singular at ver. 25 is original, part or all of the other peculiar material from ver. 5 may also have been in the second person in the source as well as in our text. At v. 33–7 we saw that vv. 34b–36 appeared to be an intrusion from another context into the passage and provided a substantial parallel to xxiii. 16–22. At ver. 36, which alone contains evidence on this point, the address is in the second person singular, despite the fact that in the context it is in the second person plural. This may suggest that originally the peculiar material from xxiii. 15 onwards was in the second person singular. If this is so it makes it impossible for the Matthean formula *οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῦσ κτλ.* to have been derived from M. We may be inclined to suggest that the formula of ver. 16, *οὐαὶ ὑμῖν ὄδηγοι τυφλοί*, does come from this source, until we remember that at xv. 14 it occurs in a Q context and may well derive from the Q phrasing. It is, however, probable that in M the material in question did not have one introductory formula, and that the formulae in our text are derived from Q. This means that we are

in considerable uncertainty about the original form of the peculiar material in Matt. xxiii. Substantially, however, it is unified by a common theme, and this may seem of itself sufficient grounds for maintaining that the peculiar verses, whatever their precise form in the source, stood together in it.

Two other points may be noticed. First, if we accept the view that conflation has taken place at vv. 25 f., 29–32, this is also evidence in favour of a second written source being used. Secondly, just as we have reason for thinking that the evangelist had added ver. 34 b, so we may suspect his activity elsewhere. Examples of this may be found at vv. 15, 32 and perhaps vv. 7 b–10 have been expanded.

There is nothing in chapter xxiv that can be assigned to M. Verses 10–12 may well be the work of the evangelist to take the place of material from Mark xiii transferred to Matt. x. The conditions implied in xxiv. 10–12 seem to be those of a later period. This also makes it the more improbable that the verses go back to an earlier source.

Most of xxv. 1–13 is peculiar to Matthew. Verse 13 is taken from Mark xiii. 35–7 and ver. 11 f. have sufficient verbal contacts with Luke xiii. 25 to suggest that they are from Q. It is difficult, however, to believe that the story originally ended with ver. 10. Perhaps the original conclusion of the story has been rewritten in Q phraseology. Verses 14–30 come from Q. The difference between the Matthean and Lucan versions may be due in part to the fact that in Luke another theme is added in xix. 12, 14, 27, and that this has led to the abbreviation of the rest of the story. The sermon, vv. 31–46, is without parallel, but has features which suggest that it is of later date. We do not know whether the evangelist found it in his peculiar source or was the first to put it into writing.

The consideration of the peculiar parables as a group has been kept back until all the material has been reviewed, in order that their common features may be examined and the probabilities about their origins investigated as a whole. Much of the discussion must concern itself with the introductory formula, *ὅμοια ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* or the like.

About this formula one fact may be taken as established. The reference to the Kingdom of Heaven at the beginning of most of the peculiar parables has support in other traditions. The formula occurs at the beginning of the parable of the Mustard Seed both in Mark iv. 30–2, and Q, Luke xiii. 18 f. It is also found in the parable of the Seed Growing Secretly, Mark iv. 26–9, and in Q, in

that of the Leaven, Luke xiii. 20 f. Hence we need feel no difficulty in finding the same kind of formula at the head of parables peculiar to Matthew.

There is also no evidence that the evangelist has prefixed the formula to a parable from Mark or Q when it was lacking in these sources. For example, the parable of the Sower lacks the introductory formula both in Mark and Matthew. It might be suggested that the evangelist has added the formula in xxii. 1-14, but we have seen reasons for thinking that here two parables have been run together and that the formula was proper to the peculiar parable. On the other side may be put the fact that, while only two parables in Mark and two in Q have this introductory formula, eight of the peculiar parables have it. But if this is taken to show that the formula is not original to the parables, then it must have been prefixed either by the editor or at an earlier stage in the tradition. His treatment of Mark and Q suggests that the editor was conservative in these matters, which is in favour of his having found the formula already in the parables. This means that arguments from sense and subject-matter, to the effect that the formula has been on occasion intruded, need not involve the conclusion that the evangelist is responsible for the intrusion.

Nor need the fact that peculiar parables with this formula now appear in a number of contexts weigh against the conclusion. The evangelist frequently rearranges the order of his material. For example, the element from Q in the Sermon on the Mount consists of two parts. One comes from the Sermon in Q but the other is drawn from quite different contexts in Q. Again, part of Mark xiii is transferred to a quite new context in Matt. x. 17-22. It is this fact that the Kingdom parables now appear scattered up and down a number of chapters that makes the retention of the initial formula the more striking. Had the evangelist created the introduction we should have expected him to produce one that linked the parable with its new context rather than one which suggested that it formerly belonged elsewhere.

An examination of the context of the parables shows that they often owe their present position to the evangelist. He has both emphasized the connexion with the surrounding material in which he has placed the parable and done much to strengthen this connexion by adding such comments at the end of the story as ensure that the required interpretation will be made. To the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins he adds from Q the warning *γρηγορεῖτε οὖν*, though the Wise Virgins slept equally with the Foolish.

In favour of the view that M contained a collection of parables may be urged the fact that in Mark iv we find a similar collection. Grouping of like material seems a natural procedure, and the evangelist frequently observes it. Matt. v-vii and xiii, built round Mark iv, are examples of this.

The phrasing of the introductory formula varies. At xiii. 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, xx. 1 we have *δρμοία ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κτλ.*, at xiii. 24, xviii. 23, xxii. 2 *ἀδμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία κτλ.*, and at xxv. 1 *ἀδμοιωθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία κτλ.* The second and third types occur only in Matthew and only with peculiar parables. They may well derive from M. The first type is much nearer to the introduction in Q at Luke xiii. 18, 20 than to the formula of Mark iv. 30, but we need not suppose that the Q formula has been intruded into peculiar parables which were without this kind of introduction at all. It is probable that in M as well as in Q and Mark the formula differed slightly from parable to parable and the evangelist has evolved two or three types of formula from this variety.

From all these considerations two conclusions seem probable. One is that the parables of the Kingdom had their introductory formula before they were incorporated into the Gospel. The other is that they are not in their original context.

These conclusions are further supported by the following arguments. In xiii. 47-50 the parable is older than the explanation attached. But while the introductory formula of the parable gives its theme as the Kingdom, the explanation treats it as a parable of judgement. Once the theme of judgement had been introduced the reference to the Kingdom would hardly be prefixed. Therefore the introductory formula must be earlier than the explanation. But the evangelist probably had the explanation before him already in writing. Therefore he must have had the introduction before him in writing as well. The same is true of the introductions and explanations of the Tares and the Marriage Feast, though here the interpretation, though it ignores the references to the Kingdom, is not so inept.

Nor need we feel that the introductory reference to the Kingdom is sometimes inappropriate. We must remember that the inappropriateness often alleged against the formula is usually inappropriate to the context or explanation that is attached. In none of the peculiar parables is the formula markedly unsuitable, especially when we recall the relatively loose connexion that is often found in Rabbinical parables. We may conclude that the Kingdom parables probably formed a collection in M which was broken

up and fitted into new contexts by the evangelist, who, however, retained the introductory formula. The fact that at xxii. 1-14 a peculiar and a Q parable were run together suggests that the peculiar parable already existed in writing.

It now remains to sum up the results of our investigation of the peculiar discourse material in the Gospel. First a list of the passages belonging to this category must be given. Next it is desirable to repeat the arguments dealing with the nature of the source. Finally something must be said about the character of the contents.

The passages from a peculiar source may be grouped as follows:

- (I) v. 21-4 (in part), 27 f., 33-7, 38-41 (in part), 19 f., vi. 1-8, 16-18. Here v. 23 f., 36 at least, vi. 7 f. are attached from other contexts.
- (II) The missionary charge, x. 5 f., 8 b, 16 b, 23, 24-5 a in part, 25 b, 41(?)
- (III) Collection of parables:
 - (a) Kingdom parables, xiii. 24-30, 36-52, xviii. 23-34, xx. 1-15, xxii. 2, 11-14, xxv. 1-10.
 - (b) Others, xxi. 28-32, xxv. 31-45.
- (IV) Against religious leaders, xxiii. 2 f., 5, 7 b-10, 15-22, 24, 26 (?), 27.
- (V) Fragments, v. 7-9 with possibly 4 and 10, 14, 16 f., vi. 34, vii. 6, 13 f. in part, 15, xi. 28-30, xii. 5 f., 7, 36 f., xv. 12 f., xviii. 10, 18-20, xix. 10-12.

We have seen several reasons for thinking that the evangelist was using a written source for this material. There is, especially in section (I) above, evidence of structure. There is also evidence of conflation and of other forms of editing. The presence of stereotyped explanations of several parables and the fact that the material has often been handed down in a relatively unchanged form are in favour of a written tradition.

About the nature of this written source there is one important question. Was it composed of discourse only, or did it contain narrative as well? It may appear that by separating discourse from narrative we have prejudged the matter. In Chapter III, however, reasons will be advanced for thinking that the peculiar narrative material was first put into writing by the evangelist while the discourse was, as we have seen, probably already in writing. This at once indicates that the narrative did not come from the same source as the sayings. This means that the written document M had no narrative material different from that in the

other sources. Mark, for example, has more narrative than discourse and even Q has a certain narrative element.

Connected with this feature of the source is its apparent weakness in connexion. In some sections a measure of continuity is provided by the structure, as in v. 17–vi. 18. But because of the lack of any links, narrative or otherwise, it is impossible to see the plan or formal character of the source as a whole. If the evangelist has not suppressed the links, it is hard to regard the document as being, in the main, anything but an assemblage of fragments. If the evangelist did suppress the links, it is equally hard to see why he created this lack of connexion and did not supply links from Mark or Q.

The source consisted of at least 170 verses. This is smaller than Q, which musters not less than 200, and makes it the smallest of our documentary sources. In fact it may have been larger, for we know that the evangelist does abbreviate. On the other hand, he sometimes adds sentences of his own, so that when the possible omissions and possible additions are both taken into account the difference to our total may be small.

These considerations of size, connexion, and lack of narrative suggest that M was a rudimentary document, more primitive in type if not in date than Mark or even Q. Its use and survival are explicable only by the fact that it contained material which had not been preserved in another source. Once this material had been incorporated in Matthew, M was bound to disappear.

Beyond this, little can be said about our source. As we have no certain means of distinguishing in detail between the remains of M and the handiwork of the editor, any conjectures must rest on the most uncertain ground. For example, it would be hazardous to infer the attitude of M toward the Pharisees from the form in which some of its material appears in Matthew. We know that the evangelist did heighten the anti-Pharisaic tone of his sources, but we have no means of knowing what was originally said about the Pharisees in M. This uncertainty must for the same reason be extended to place, date, and authorship.

III

THE PECULIAR NARRATIVES

Summary. The peculiar narratives are divided into five groups, the Nativity stories, the Petrine stories, the Passion and Resurrection stories, miscellaneous items, and the quotations. Investigation of these groups, especially of their substance and contexts, reveals that they are late, with few traces of early oral tradition. Many of them have grown round Mark, they are in the evangelist's style, and seem to have been first put into writing by him. They cannot be accounted for on the documentary hypothesis and we have to look elsewhere for an explanation of them.

BESIDES the document M there remain other peculiar elements in Matthew, consisting of narrative and quotations from the Old Testament. We have now to discover in what form these elements found their way into the Gospel, bearing in mind as we do so the various theories advanced to explain this process, amongst which we must pay special attention to the view propounded by Soltau and held with various modifications by others, for example by Bacon, that the evangelist used a document N which provided these sections.

First we must sift out these elements and arrange them in groups of related material, a task much easier than the analysis of the discourses, from which the narrative elements can as a rule be easily kept distinct, though we shall find that one or two passages of discourses, such as xviii. 15–22, must be taken into account. The main sections that we have to treat are as follows:

- (a) The Nativity stories.
- (b) Petrine stories: xiv. 28–31, xvi. 17–19, xvii. 24–7, with which we must take xviii. 15–22; cf. xv. 15.
- (c) Passion and Resurrection stories: xxvi. 52–4, xxvii. 3–10, 19, 24 f., 51–3, 62–6, xxviii. 2–4, 9–20.
- (d) Miscellaneous narratives: iii. 14 f., iv. 23, ix. 35, xv. 22–4, xvii. 6 f., xxi. 10 f., 14–16.
- (e) Quotations.

Smaller elements such as xvii. 13, xxvi. 25, 44, are so clearly editorial expansions of the Marcan story that there is no need to take further notice of them.

As groups (b), (c), (d) require much the same kind of treatment, while groups (a), (e) have peculiar problems attached to them which complicate the investigation, it seems easiest for us to begin

with the three middle groups, leaving the two that remain for separate examination.

The Petrine stories, with which we begin, have been frequently discussed, but as the present inquiry is into the sources and composition of the Gospel, we have to ask ourselves primarily not what was the origin of the stories but in what form the writer of the Gospel found them, how much they owe to him, and how much to an already existing tradition. We must first notice xv. 15. In the source, Mark vii. 17, the disciples asked Jesus to explain the parable. In Matthew it is Peter who asks. The answer gives a ruling on clean and unclean, a matter on which, as we know from Acts, the Church had to spend anxious thought. In Mark vii. 21 f. there is a list of dispositions and deeds which make a man unclean. In Matt. xv. 19 this list is, apart from the first term *διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί*, reduced to a list of actionable offences and the dispositions are omitted. A principle of morals is thus converted into a precept of law. Peter's association with legal rulings appears too in the other passages. We notice that the whole section can be derived only from Mark and no other source, written or oral, is required.

In xviii. 15–22 there is a larger peculiar element. Verses 15, 21 f. have their parallel in Luke xvii. 3 f. and probably come from Q. The following words which are absent from the Lucan parallel are characteristic of the editor, *προσελθεῖν*, *ἐως* as a preposition, *τότε*, and probably *ὑπάγειν*, and *κερδαίνειν*. Of the evangelist's introduction of dialogue into his sources there is another example at xix. 18, compared with Mark x. 18. Verses 18–20 come from M with traces of the editor's style. There remain 16 f. As they stand they clearly depend on ver. 15. The addition of a quotation from the Old Testament to the context is frequently made by the evangelist as at viii. 17, xxi. 4 f., xxvii. 43. *παραλαμβάνειν* and *ἔτι* are characteristic of his style. *τελώνης* is common to him and M, while *ἔθνικός* occurs twice in M passages. *ἐκκλησία* occurs in the Gospels only at xvi. 18 and *παρακούειν* in this sense appears here alone. This evidence suggests that either behind these verses there is another saying from M, or the evangelist has expanded the core from Q. Editorial expansion seems more likely, and if this is so we may be able to lay the peculiar element in ver. 15, *ἐλέγχειν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ*, to the same account. In any case, it is probable from the break in sequence after ver. 17 that vv. 18–20 did not originally stand with 16 f. From these points we may argue that the whole passage can be accounted for on the assumption

that M and Q have provided the material which was then expanded.

Besides two noteworthy features which occur at xv. 15, the introduction of Peter's name and the alteration of a rule for individual practice into a rule for Church discipline, there are two new features, in xviii. 15–22, the mention of the Church and the statement of authority.

The passage xvi. 17–19 is similar to xviii. 15–22, but the characteristic features are made more explicit and at the same time more precise. The narrative context vv. 13–16, 20, is provided from Mark viii. 27–30. The bulk of ver. 19 comes from M and reappears at xviii. 18. For the remainder of the verses we have no obvious sources. There are traces of the editor in the phrases ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν. It will also be recalled that the disjunction οὐ(κ) . . . ἀλλά is introduced by the editor at xviii. 22. The words ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἑκκλησίαν resemble vii. 24, δοτις ὠκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, a clause which is worded differently in the Lucan parallel. The earlier part of ver. 19 seems to be an echo of Isa. xxii. 22, part of which ran in Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus as follows: καὶ δώσω τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δανειδ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕμου αὐτοῦ.¹ Some texts add αὐτῷ after δώσω. The evangelist inserts Old Testament allusions in his text in several places, for example iii. 4 (omit the phrase in Mark i. 6), iii. 16. πύλαι ἄδου may also be an echo of Isa. xxxviii. 10, Wisd. xvi. 13, 3 Macc. v. 51. Finally, the statement in ver. 18, κἀγώ δέ σοι λέγω στι σὺ εἰ Πέτρος, may be a simple conversion into direct speech of the statement at Mark iii. 16, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν σὸνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον. κἀγώ is introduced three times into Marcan contexts in Matthew.

From this it is apparent that the evangelist may be responsible for the composition of the section, apart from the elements derived from the sources Mark and M. This suggestion is supported by the fact that the verses as they stand depend on the Marcan context; they cannot be taken out of it and read as an isolated unit. Further, three of the four themes that appeared in xviii. 15–22 appear here also. Peter's name has no need to be introduced, as it is already in Mark's account. The statement of authority reappears and with it the mention of the Church. As the presence of these themes together in the other section is due to the editor, there is a presumption that it is so here.

¹ Septuaginta, auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum, XIV, Isaías (ed. J. Zeigler), 199–200, or Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, iii. 139.

On the other hand, the possibility that he may have had an independent though unwritten tradition remains, and this possibility may be considered in several connexions.

First, at John i. 41 f. we have a similar passage. Here Andrew's announcement of Jesus as Messiah is followed by Jesus' renaming Σίμων ὁ νιὸς Ἰωάννου as *Κηφᾶς*. The confession and renaming occur in a different context and Andrew, not Peter, makes the confession. On the other hand, ὁ νιὸς Ἰωάννου recalls *βαπτιωνᾶ* and the renaming takes place.

Secondly, the Confession has been suspected of belonging originally to the Resurrection stories. With that time John xx. 23, parallel to Matt. xvi. 19, is associated. It also adds point to the clause about the Gates of Hell and to the addition in ver. 16 of ὁ νιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. We have an example of such a transference of post-Resurrection material to the period of the Ministry in Luke v. 1-11, where elements from John xxi have been conflated with Mark i. 16-20.

Thirdly, though it is the evangelist who associates Peter with these various themes, he must have had some grounds for doing so and these grounds can lie only in the history of the early Church or of Jesus, that is, they belong to tradition.

Beyond this the present inquiry need not go, as we have arrived at two conclusions relevant to our inquiry. First, there is no need to assume a special source for any of these sections, and, secondly, they may well have a basis in unwritten tradition though that basis cannot be clearly discerned.

xiv. 28-31 likewise depends very much on its Marcan context. Much less, however, than xvi. 17-19 does it yield to analysis, standing quite unparalleled in whole and part to the rest of the gospel material. Nor does it give other indications of its origin. The language of the section, however, furnishes several clues. It is noteworthy that Mark vi. 45-52, as always in Mark and regularly in Matthew in the verses derived from Mark, uses θάλασσα, but in Matt. xiv. 28-9 we have θάλαττα. At viii. 32 end, for Mark's θάλασσα, θάλαττα is substituted and this use of θάλαττα for θάλασσα occurs nowhere in Mark. καταποντίζεσθαι recurs at xviii. 6, being introduced into a Marcan context and διστάζειν at xxviii. 17 in a peculiar narrative. δλιγόπιστε, a word which occurs in Q once (vi. 30, Luke xii. 28), seems to have caught the evangelist's fancy as he intrudes it twice into Marcan passages, viii. 26, xvi. 8, in all using it four times. κελεύειν does not occur in Mark. It is inserted at least three times into Marcan sections by the editor (xiv. 9, 19, xxvii. 58) and

occurs once elsewhere in a peculiar passage, xxvii. 64. But it is its absence from Marcan usage rather than its presence in Matthew that must be of interest. *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is found here only in Matthew and once at viii. 23 in Mark. It is frequently used in Luke and Acts. *κύριε σῶσον* appears also at viii. 25, where the editor writes the phrase into a passage from Mark. This use of *κύριε* is frequent in Matthew, but only once in Mark, vii. 28. The rest of the wording, though it is not peculiarly Matthean, is quite characteristic of the Gospel. This suggests either that the evangelist is the first to put the story into writing, or else that, if he had a written source before him, he has completely rewritten it in his own style. The way in which the story wholly depends on the Marcan context favours the former alternative.

While there is a Buddhist parallel to the story, we cannot presume dependence of Matthew on it, though it may have been a common theme of the times, but we may find in Matthew a reflection of a Resurrection story. At John xxi. 7 f. Peter ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν γαλασσαν. οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἤλθον. If we link this with the theme of Peter's fall and restoration we can see how our incident developed as an allegory of these events.

At first sight the one self-contained unit in this group is the story of the poll-tax in xvii. 24–7. A glance at the synopsis, however, shows that from Mark ix. 33, καὶ ἤλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος, have been derived xvii. 24, ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καφαρναούμ, and 25, καὶ ἐλθόντα εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. If we remove these phrases we have a coherent story, but it is remarkable how the Marcan element has been woven in.

The section has traces of Matthean diction in *προσῆλθον*, τί σοι δοκεῖ, κῆπον, ἅραγε, ἀνοίξας, στατήρα, ἀντί. On the other hand, the peculiar element is larger, διδραχμα, τελεῖ, τέλη, προέφθασεν, ἀλλοτρίων, ἐλεύθεροι, ἄγκιστρον. Some of these words are required by the particular point at issue such as διδραχμα, τελεῖ, and τέλη in this sense, ἄγκιστρον, and perhaps ἀλλοτρίων and ἐλεύθεροι. *προέφθασεν* is not to be explained thus and οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς¹ is an uncommon phrase. Still, in view of the predominantly Matthean character of the style, one or two such unusual expressions must not be given too great weight.

In substance the story is composite. Verses 24–6, whatever the exact meaning of the details, belong together, while ver. 27 introduces a different motif, one common to the story-telling of antiquity. The verse has also point in giving an answer, or rather two

¹ Ps. ii. 2. Probably the evangelist is again echoing an Old Testament phrase.

answers, to a pressing question of the years A.D. 70–96: were Christian, like non-Christian, Jews liable to the poll-tax? Before A.D. 70 every male Jew above 19 years of age paid an half-shekel yearly to the temple (cf. Neh. x. 32, Exod. xxx. 11–16). It may be that vv. 24–6 originally had reference to this. After A.D. 70 this poll-tax was transferred to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and to such a state of affairs ver. 27 would refer. The legend on coins of Nerva, ‘fisci Iudaici calumnia sublata’, shows that he abolished the tax. Apparently he exempted Christians also from the obligation to the *fiscus Iudaicus*. The fact that for the Rabbis at the beginning of the second century some details were uncertain indicates that the tax was obsolete at this date.¹

If we take vv. 24–6 by themselves, they resemble the pronouncement stories of the older tradition. If they originally belonged to this class, they furnish probably the only example of a narrative in Matthew which is of an early type but does not derive from Q or Mark. We must not, however, forget the implications of xviii. 21 f. Here a simple saying has been converted into this type of story by introducing the name of Peter and the elements of dialogue leading up to the pronouncement of xviii. 22. The same thing may well have happened at xvii. 24–6. A saying now irrecoverable may have been converted into a story by the introduction of the dialogue with Peter. Whether the tax collectors are part of the original setting of the story or were added when Peter was introduced is uncertain. Next, to meet the situation after A.D. 70, ver. 27 was introduced, apt as it was in view of Peter's occupation as fisherman. Finally, the evangelist attached it to its present setting by using Mark ix. 33.

In this story also, the introduction of Peter is associated with the giving of a ruling on a point at issue. The story did not reach its present form at one stage and does not seem to have been before the evangelist in writing. It owes something to him, but how much cannot be discovered. Whence the saying comes, which seems to be the core of the section, is quite unknown. M is the least unlikely guess.

It now remains to sum up the probabilities about the sections as a whole, bearing in mind as we do so these questions: how did the evangelist come by this material? and, in particular, did any of it come to him in writing otherwise than through Q or Mark?

¹ For the Jewish evidence see Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, i. 760–73, and, in general, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, iv. 237–8, and for the Syrian coinage, *ibid.* 211–23.

First, several of the sections show traces of compositeness and depend closely on their contexts. A variety of sources was used for xviii. 15–22 and xvi. 17–19, while xvii. 24–7 likewise divides into two parts. Only xiv. 28–31 refuses to be analysed in this way, but is completely dependent on its context. xvi. 17–19 has the same dependence, and taken by themselves the two passages would be largely incomprehensible.

Nor, apart from the prominence of Peter, do the sections have a common character as distinct from that of the Gospel as a whole. In all there are strong traces of the style of the evangelist, who seems to have written xiv. 28–31 entirely in his own words. xvi. 17–19 and xvii. 24–7 show a slightly more individual phrasing, distinct from each other as well as from the rest of the Gospel, and due in part to the technical terms of xvii. 24–7 and in part to the markedly Semitic expressions of xvi. 17–19.

The appearance of two traditional themes of story-telling in xiv. 28–31 and xvii. 27 is interesting, but does not by itself answer our question, though it suggests that in their final form the narratives are late and were open to a variety of influences in their growth.

Another group of themes points the same way. In xviii. 15–22 and xvi. 17–19 Peter and the Church, authority and discipline appear as conjoined themes. In xv. 15 and xvii. 24–7 decisions are given to Peter on particular issues, uncleanness, and the poll-tax. One we know was a matter of dispute in the early Church and it is hard to see how the other could have failed to be so. Quite apart from their bearing on the significance of Peter for the evangelist and the community in which he wrote his Gospel, the relevance of the material to the life of the Church in A.D. 70–100 suggests, when it is taken together with the other evidence, that the incidents in their present forms and connexions are late.

Further, two of the stories seem to echo events in Peter's life, especially his denial, his confession, and his restoration after the Resurrection. It is remarkable in view of this that, while Luke xxiv. 34, John xxi. 1 ff., 1 Cor. xv. 5 all mention appearances to Peter, Matthew on the contrary omits the one place in Mark, xvi. 7 (cf. Matt. xxviii. 7), where Peter is mentioned in the Resurrection story. It must, however, be frankly recognized that, though suggestions of this kind may bear the speciousness of probability, they are patent conjectures, and in our ignorance point to no definite conclusions.

These considerations seem to give us the answer to one part of

our question. The evangelist did not take the Petrine sections from a written source. They are of various derivation and, while elements are taken from our documents Mark, Q, and M, much is owed to construction and invention, so that we suspect from their shadows the influence of events whose substance we cannot apprehend. Here and there, too, an oral tradition may have left traces. It is in some ways a difficult conclusion, as it does not show us how the narrative grew, but the difficulty must be held back for later treatment.

Next come the stories of the Passion and the Resurrection. Apart from xxvi. 25, of which the chief importance is that it shows how the Marcan narrative can be supplemented by the invention of further details which depend upon it, the first peculiar section is xxvi. 52-4. The vocabulary of the passage accords with that of the Gospel as a whole. *ἀποστρέφειν* occurs here only, in the New Testament, with this sense; with other meanings it appears at v. 42, Luke xxiii. 14, Acts iii. 26, Rom. xi. 26, thrice in the Pastorals, and at Heb. xii. 25. *τόπος* is very frequent but it is nowhere else used quite like this. *παριστάναι* in this sense appears at Luke ii. 22 and thrice in Acts. It occurs six times in Mark, but not with this meaning. *λεγίων* is here only in Matthew. It appears at Mark v. 9, 15 and from Mark at Luke viii. 30, but nowhere else in the New Testament. The rest of the vocabulary is characteristic of Matthew but not peculiar to him.

Whence vv. 52 f. are derived is uncertain. There is the substantial parallel of John xviii. 11, *βάλε τὴν μάχαιραν εἰς τὴν θήκην*, which, however, is linguistically so differently worded that no literary relation can be inferred. The second half of ver. 52 may well incorporate an independent saying. The origin of ver. 53 is obscure. The thought is probably on the lines of Mark xi. 20-5. Verse 54 takes up the refrain of Mark xiv. 49 and provides a hint for the reason of the addition. It was intended to explain why Jesus did not encourage the resistance of the disciples. The addition argues that the ground for submission was not impotence but the fulfilment of Scripture and the refusal to meet force with its like. Without the Marcan passage which it is intended to explain, the addition is meaningless. The partial resemblance to John may be due to the fact that both evangelists felt this need for an explanation. Otherwise, apart from 52 b, which may come from M, there is no need to assume a written source for any of the material.

xxvii. 3-10 has a more complicated history behind it. Its phrasing is as markedly that of the editor as is that of xiv. 28-31, *μετα-*

μέλεσθαι, στρέφειν (though it is only here in this sense), *ἀργύρια* (meaning silver coins), the phrase *ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πρεοπότεροι, ἀθῶος* or *δίκαιος*, whichever be read, *αἷμα* in a derived sense, *σὺ ὅμη, ρίπτειν, ἀναχωρεῖν, ἐπει, ξένος, ἡ σήμερον, ἔως* as a preposition, *τότε, the whole of 9a, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν*, all these expressions are characteristic of the Matthean style. The following are exceptional in the Gospel: *πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἀπήγξατο, τιμῆ, κεραμεύς, and ταφή*¹ but all except the first are required by the subject-matter of the story. From these facts we may argue that the style convincingly points to the evangelist as responsible for putting the story into written form.

The purpose of the tale is clear. The audience of the gospel story as it is told in Mark would want to know what happened to Judas. The addition in Matthew sets out to satisfy this curiosity and presupposes the Marcan story of the betrayal, but presupposes it as something requiring a sequel. The treachery could not be merely related and thereafter ignored. It had to be made clear that Judas, after his villainy, did not continue unaffected by it. To dispel this silence the story of his repentance and unhappy end was attached.

It was not, however, invented out of nothing, but was based on an assortment of materials. These may be divided into two. The first division will contain elements common to Matthew and Acts i. 18-20 and the second the quotation from Zech. xi. 12f.

There are several differences between the account in Acts and that in our Gospel. In Matthew, Judas hangs himself and the high priests buy the field, but in Acts it is he who buys the field and he dies from disease. On the other hand, there are remarkable agreements. In both stories Judas does come to an untimely end, the field is called 'the field of blood', and it is bought with the money of betrayal. This suggests that there is a tradition of some age behind the two stories, vague in detail though that tradition may be. The name *ἀγρὸς αἵματος*, with its Aramaic equivalent *אֲקֶלְדָּמָךְ*, derives from a Semitic source.² In this connexion the use of *κορβανᾶν* with its implication of a reference to an Hebrew text of Zech. xi. 12f., differing from the LXX and M.T., is noteworthy. The independence of other versions shown in the quotation in ver. 9f. likewise favours independent recourse to a peculiar Hebrew original.³ These facts imply that the tradition behind our story goes back to a Semitic original.

¹ *τάφος* occurs six times in Matthew, but in none of the other Gospels nor in Acts.

² On *κορβανᾶν* cf. Strack-Billerbeck, i, ad. loc., and Klostermann, *Markusevangelium*³, on Mark vii. 11.

³ This point is developed in the section on quotations.

While the story appears, though in a somewhat different form, in Acts, without the quotation or any trace of it, the quotation from Zechariah has contributed something to the story as it stands in Matthew. The influence of the quotation is also apparent at xxvi. 15. In view of the fact, to be investigated later, that the evangelist used the LXX for his quotations, the presence of a quotation here which is independent both of the LXX and the M.T. suggests that it is due not to the evangelist but to an earlier source. On the other hand, the presence of *κορβανῶν* in ver. 6 suggests two independent uses of the same text in Zechariah.

The history of the passage may be reconstructed somewhat as follows: the need felt for a sequel to the Marcan story of the betrayal was met by the tradition which connected Judas's death with the field of blood, purchased by the betrayal money, a tradition which came into being against a Semitic background and existed in two forms, one appearing in the Acts and the other in Matthew, where the variety of forms was in part due to the fact that the story was not at this stage fixed in writing; to explain the story as it appeared in the tradition behind Matthew, two references were made to Zech. xi. 12f., of which the earlier dealt with Judas putting the money into the treasury and the later with the purchase of the potters' field. Finally, the evangelist wrote the story down with the quotation from Zechariah in its peculiar form. The conclusion, then, is that while the story has a complicated history which rests on an early tradition, the evangelist did not derive it from a written source.

xxvii. 19, 24f. may be taken together as they seem to have a common purpose, the explanation of the parts played by Pilate and the Jews in the trial. Mark's account might prompt the question: why was Pilate loath to condemn Jesus? Unlike Luke, who creates out of Pilate's reluctance one of several testimonies to Jesus' innocence, Matthew assigns the dream as the reason for his course of action. This is followed by Pilate's formal denial of responsibility and its assumption by the whole Jewish people.

Though the style is not perhaps quite so markedly Matthean as is that of xxvii. 3-10, it shows a similar character. *σήμερον, κατ'* *δναρ,* *ώφελῦν, ἀπέναντι* (this seems the better reading), *ἀθρόος, αἴμα,* *ὑμεῖς ὅψεσθε, λαός,* all are proper to the evangelist's style. *βῆμα* and *ἀπενύφατο* (*νίπτειν* is at vi. 17, xv. 2) are not found elsewhere in the Gospel but are due to the requirements of the subject-matter. On the whole, the language seems to point to the passage being written up by the editor of the Gospel.

While, according to Origen, the hand-washing was not a Roman custom, there are Jewish parallels, which however tell us nothing of the origin of the story. If ver. 25 has the destruction of Jerusalem in view, which seems probable, the development of the tradition would belong to the period after A.D. 70. The dependence on the Marcan narrative and the strong traces of Matthean style, together with the motivation of the incident, would all support the suggestion that the passage is secondary. It may be that in ver. 25 to the question : how were the Jews punished for their part in the condemnation? the answer is hinted at, that they paid the penalty in A.D. 70.

In vv. 51-4 the increased number of portents, by heightening the effect, are made to explain the centurion's confession. Though the addition depends on Mark, it gives quite a different turn to the course of events. In Mark the death of Jesus moved the centurion to his confession; in Matthew it is the accompanying portents that effect this. Apparently it was felt that some more impressive explanation of the comment was needed than the mere death itself. The phrase *μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ* is difficult on this interpretation. It seems probable that the openings of the tombs and the appearances of the dead were originally associated with the Resurrection stories and only later transferred to this place. A similar looseness of connexion may be seen at xxi. 10-17.

The style is of a piece with that of the other additions. Though *ἔγειρεν* occurs several times with like meaning, and seems to be preferred by the evangelist to *ἀνιστάναι*, *ἔγερσις* is found only here in the New Testament. *ἐμφανίζειν* and, in this sense, *ἄγιος*, are used only here in Matthew. *σεισμός* and *σείειν* are favourite words with the editor, as is also *ἀνοίγειν*. *κοιμᾶν* appears again at xxviii. 13 and *ἄγια πόλις* is at iv. 5 also. Little can be made of the frequency of *πέτρα* and *σῶμα*.

The increase of the marvellous, and the obvious development of the story from Mark, suggest that this passage too is secondary, and the style does not prevent the conclusion that it was first written down when it was incorporated in the Gospel.

With xxvii. 62-6 we have the first of the incidents that group themselves round the tomb and the Resurrection. The theme is taken up in xxviii. 2-4, 11-15. These narratives clearly presuppose the story of the Resurrection from the tomb but do not so clearly depend upon the Marcan form of the story as do most of the incidents already noticed. On the other hand, the motivation is explicit. It is apologetic and seeks to rebut Jewish attempts to discredit

the story of the Empty Tomb and, with it, of the Resurrection. It may be noted that the three stories cohere and seem to answer a series of questions. Did the Jews, forewarned by Jesus, take any precautions? Why did the precautions fail? How did the Jews circumvent the evidence of the guard? At xxviii. 2-4 the evangelist gives vent to his liking for the supernatural.

In xxvii. 62-6 some expressions are peculiar, such as ἐπαύριον, πλάνος, πλάνη, σφραγίζειν, κουστωδία, ἀσφαλίζειν, παρασκευή,¹ but are almost all required by the substance of the passage. On the other hand, συνάγειν, ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, μιμήσκεσθαι, ζῆν, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, κελεύειν, οὖν, τάφος, ἔως, μήποτε, κλέπτειν, λαός, ἔφη, and πορεύεσθαι are all paralleled in other parts of the Gospel and seem to be characteristic.

In xxviii. 2-4 the following do not recur in the Gospel: ἀποκυλίειν (this seems to be derived from Mark xvi. 3), εἰδέα, and χίων, while these words belong to the evangelist's vocabulary: ὕδοι, σεισμός, ἄγγελος κυρίου, καταβαίνειν, ἐπάνω, ἔνδυμα, λευκός, and τηρεῖν. In xxviii. 11-15, the language is still strongly Matthean: πορεύεσθαι, ὕδοι, ἀπαγγέλλειν, τὰ γενόμενα, συνάγειν, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν, νικτός, κλέπτειν, κοιμᾶσθαι, ἥγεμων, πειθεῖν, ἀργυρία, διαφημίζειν, παρά with the dative, μεχρὶ τῆς σήμερον. ἀμέριμνος occurs only here and in 1 Cor. vii. 32 in the New Testament.

The indications of style, the obviously apologetic purpose of the passages, and the enlargement of the marvellous in xxviii. 2-4, together favour a late date for the narratives, and suggest that the evangelist was the first to put them into writing.

From xxviii. 9 onward Matthew is without the guidance of Mark's narrative, ending as this does at xvi. 8, and the two sections xxviii. 9 f., 16-20 are the evangelist's attempt to fill the gap. This statement presumes several points that have been disputed. It has been suggested that the editor of Matthew had a form of the Gospel according to St. Mark which still had the original ending, and that traces of this original ending are to be found in Matt. xxviii. 9-20. Here, however, it is assumed that, until later the longer ending xvi. 9-20 or the shorter ending was attached, the Gospel as known to the Church always ended at xvi. 8 and that this was the form of the Gospel used in producing Matthew.

The style both of xxviii. 9 f. and of xxviii. 16-20 is quite Matthean. In xxviii. 9 f. the following expressions are favoured by the evangelist: ὕδοι, χαίρειν, προσκυνεῖν, τότε, φοβεῖσθαι, προσέρχεσθαι, ἀπαγγέλλειν, ἀπέρχεσθαι, ἐκεῖ, and in xxviii. 16-20 these:

¹ Probably from Mark xv. 42.

πορεύεσθαι, οὐ, προσκυνεῖν, διστάζειν, οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ, μαθητεύειν, ἔθνος, τηρεῖν, ἐντέλεσθαι, ἔως, συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος. This evidence is strongly in favour of the view that the two sections were written by the evangelist and not derived from an earlier written document such as a lost ending of Mark.

Compared with the accounts in Luke and John and the traditions implied by 1 Cor. xv. 3-7, the materials available for the evangelist in his attempt to fill the gap at the end of Mark were poor in the extreme. The incident in ver. 9f. is unparalleled in the other Gospels. The substance of ver. 9 is largely conventional and ver. 10 is made up from the angel's speech, especially ver. 5 and ver. 7. It is clear that the tradition of an appearance to the women came to the evangelist in a vague form, meagre in detail. Together with the addition at the end of ver. 8 it may be due to the desire to do away with the silence with which Mark ends.

The appearance to the eleven in Galilee is related in a much fuller form. A Galilean appearance is implied by Mark, and John xxi recounts one. Verse 16 refers the disciples to the command implied in Mark xiv. 28, xvi. 7 (cf. Matt. xxvi. 32, xxviii. 7). *τὸ ὅπος*, however, creates a difficulty, and there is no passage in the Gospel with which it can be connected. In ver. 17 *οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν* may echo the incident which appears in John as the story of Doubting Thomas. The speech of vv. 18-20 is suspect in its phrasing and its threefold baptismal formula. The earlier formula seems to have been *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*, Acts xix. 5 (cf. 1 Cor. i. 13). On the other hand, in both Luke and John there are sayings commissioning the disciples, among the Resurrection stories, cf. Luke xxiv. 47-9, John xx. 21-3, xxi. 15 ff., Acts i. 8. In this way it may be admitted that there is probably an element of tradition behind the story in the assertion of an appearance in Galilee and a formal commission of the disciples, but this element reached the evangelist in an inexact and unwritten form which he has recorded in his own phrasing.

To sum up, it may be said that the additional Passion and Resurrection incidents, far from deriving from an independent and continuous narrative, seem to have been written down by the evangelist with but occasional contacts with really old tradition, and that very broken down and vague in outline. The poverty of independent material is shown most clearly as soon as the Marcan account ends and the evangelist is left to other sources. Some small independent elements are to be found in the story of Judas, the saying, xxvi. 52, and the appearance in Galilee in xxviii. 16-20.

The Jewish character of the additions, the apologetic motive, the inclination to the marvellous, together with the frequent dependence on Mark, are their main characteristics. These characteristics, together with their strongly Matthean style, seem to put out of court the possibility that a written source was used.

Next the miscellaneous items will be treated. Here the same criteria will be applied, importance being given to questions of style, relation to the Marcan context, and motivation. Of course it is impossible to expect a thread of narrative continuity uniting the various passages.

The first is iii. 14f. *διακωλύειν* and the participle *πρέπον* occur only here in the Gospels, while *χρείαν ἔχειν*, *πληροῦν*, *δικαιοσύνη*, *τότε* are Matthean. The story requires the Marcan context and seems to be due to the fact that the Baptism proved a difficulty to later reflection. Why had Jesus to be baptized? did his baptism imply sin? did it point to his inferiority to John? The passage quoted by Jerome from the Gospel according to the Hebrews suggests that the second question was a real problem to Christians. The phrase *πληρώσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην* answers both it and the first question. Verse 14 meets the third with a clear denial of such a possibility. These considerations point to the probability, supported also by the contextual dependence on Mark, that the story is secondary, arising out of reflections on and criticisms of the Marcan record. This conclusion militates against the verses being available in writing for the editor of the Gospels.

The next two sections may be briefly dismissed. iv. 13–16 consists mainly in the quotation from Isa. ix. 1f. and a prose introduction. In the form *Ναζαρά* occurring also at Luke iv. 16 only, has been seen a reminiscence of Q. iv. 23–5 is made up largely of stock phrases from Mark i. 34, 39, iii. 7f., 10, vi. 54f., and need not be further considered.

In xv. 22–4 we have an expansion of the Marcan story vii. 24–30. Verse 22 depends on Mark x. 48 as well as Mark vii. 25. Verse 24 uses the saying recorded at x. 6 also, and may well be derived from M. The language shows features paralleled elsewhere in Matthew, *τὰ δύρια, δαιμονίζεσθαι, προσέρχεσθαι, ἀπολύειν*. The composite nature of the passage, together with the obvious dependence on Mark, shows that it is not derived from a written source other than Mark and M. Verse 23, the substance of which, as distinct from the wording, may depend on the story of Blind Bartimeus, Mark x. 46–52, is probably the free composition of the evangelist. The motivation of the passage is obscure.

The addition at xvii. 6f. has a Matthean vocabulary, *σφόδρα*, *προσέρχεσθαι*, *φοβεῖσθαι*, *ἔγείρειν*, while *πίπτειν ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον* recurs at xxvi. 39. It, too, depends on the Marcan narrative. Apparently it was thought that in Mark the disciples did not react suitably to the voice, and this addition was made to remedy the defect.

Mark xi. 11, 15–19 is clearly the basis for Matt. xxi. 10–17, but ver. 10f. in the main and 14–16 are derived from elsewhere. Their style is Matthean: *πόλις* is much commoner in Matthew than in Mark, while *στέιν*, the plural of *σχλος*, *προφήτης* are all in the Matthean style. *προσέρχεσθαι*, *θεραπεύειν*, *ναὶ* (it should be omitted at Mark vii. 18), *οὐδέποτε* are likewise Matthean expressions, though *θαυμάσιος* occurs here only in the New Testament. Verses 10 f. describe the reaction of the city as a whole to the Triumphal Entry. Verses 14–17 recount that of high priests and scribes, without referring to the cleansing of the Temple. This suggests that these two sections were at one time continuous and belonged to this context before Mark xi. 15–19 was transferred to its present position at Matt. xxi. 12 and split them up. While it is clear that the additional material, dependent on the Marcan narrative and written up in the Matthean style, does not derive from another written document, the disorder caused by the intrusion of xxi. 12 f. shows that the comments had a history before their appearance in writing in the Gospel. Of the parallel to Luke xix. 39f., remote and fortuitous as it is, nothing can be made.

This examination of the miscellaneous items has made these points clear. Apart from the lack of a common thread to join them, the sections depend severally on the Marcan context to be intelligible. The motivation, in the main, issues from reflections on this Marcan narrative. Apart from borrowings from Mark, Q, or M, the passages are in the evangelist's style. These facts, taken together, seem to make the hypothesis of a written source impossible.

The Birth stories differ from the sections already examined in two ways: they are independent of our three main sources, and they constitute a large stretch of continuous narrative. Accordingly it is here, if anywhere, that we may expect to find traces of an independent written source. The independent character of the narrative also deprives us of one criterion, the relation of the sections under examination to the context, be it Marcan or from M or Q. The criteria of vocabulary and style, of motivation and substantial analysis still remain to us.

Another test is applicable here, that of the quotations. They

will be investigated later, but the following conclusions drawn from that investigation will be presupposed. Where a quotation does not conform to the LXX, it is probable that it was not first provided by the evangelist: where, however, it is according to the LXX, the question remains open, it being possible that the quotation was supplied either by the evangelist or at an earlier date.

The genealogy provides little in the way of linguistic evidence. Only *γενέα* and *λεγόμενος* are distinctive of the style of the Gospel as a whole. Nothing can be made of *γεννᾶν*. *βίβλος* is rare in the New Testament and does not recur in Matthew. *μετοικεσία* occurs only in this section, though the verb appears at Acts vii. 4, 23. *γένεος* appears at i. 1, 18, Luke i. 14, and twice in James. The genealogy depends on the LXX as far as '*Ἄβιονδ*'. Thence onward the source is unknown. The schematic arrangement is typical of the evangelist. The purpose behind the list is to demonstrate the Jewish and Davidic descent of the Christ, a theme which reappears in the Gospel. The textual variations in ver. 16 affect our inquiry little. If we take the reading of Syr. Sin. (cf. *Arm.*, Aphraates, Dionysius bar Salibi), the text conflicts with the assertion of Mary's virginity: if we follow the normal text, the genealogy is but loosely related to Jesus. It was probably the intention of the evangelist to have it both ways by maintaining both Mary's virginity and by advancing the genealogy as proof of his Jewish and Davidic descent. That the genealogy is to be understood only in an artificial sense is shown by the omission of three generations in ver. 8 and four in ver. 11. Again the names of vv. 12–15 are too few for the period of time involved.

From these considerations it is clear that there is no difficulty in assigning the genealogy to the editor. To this the names of unknown origin in vv. 13–15 provide no objection. Whencesoever we derive them their ultimate source remains a problem. The references to Tamar, Rahab, Bathsheba may reflect Jewish controversy.¹

In vv. 18–25 the style can be more easily tested. The following expressions are Matthean: *οὕτως*, *μή* with the aorist subjunctive, *θέλειν*, *ἐνθυμεῖσθαι*, *ἰδού*, *ἄγγελος κυρίου*, *κατ' ὄνταρ*, *φαίνεσθαι*, *φοβεῖσθαι*, *παραλαμβάνειν* (only here in this sense), *τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν* (at xxvi. 56), *ἴνα πληρωθῆ*, *ἔως*, and *ἐγείρειν*. There are several unusual words: *μηνοτεύειν*, *συνέρχεσθαι*, *δειγματίζειν*, *λάθρα*, *μεθερμηνεύεσθαι*, and in this sense *γινώσκειν*. They are mainly due to the requirements of the narrative and it may be said that the section as a whole bears the stamp of the evangelist's manner.

¹ Cf. Box, *St. Matthew* (Century Bible), 71 ff.

The quotations supply some evidence. i. 23 is from the LXX of Isa. vii. 14, but the fact that it occurs also at Luke i. 31 probably shows that it had already become traditional in this connexion. This prevents us from inferring that in this place the use of the LXX is an indication of the evangelist's activity. At ver. 21 we have a quotation from Ps. cxxx. 8, which however does not accord exactly with either LXX or M.T. The LXX runs *καὶ αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ*, while the Hebrew may be translated 'and he shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities'. The points of difference both from M.T. and LXX are 'his people' for 'Israel' and the omission of 'all'. This means, according to our principle, that the quotation is older than the evangelist. It further indicates a knowledge of the meaning of Jesus in Hebrew, thus implying a Semitic background. The quotations, then, suggest that there is an element in the story definitely older than the evangelist.

This conclusion is supported by the motivation. While the story presumes the virginity of Mary, its main purpose is to answer the question 'Why, if this were so, did Joseph not divorce his wife?' It was a point that was bound to be raised in controversy and the apologetic motive in the Gospel has already been noted. But this very fact of controversy implies that the virginity of Mary was already part of the Christian story, a conclusion that is also supported by the independent agreement of Luke in this assertion. In this way we may assume that on the basis of the tradition of the Virgin Conception and the quotations, the evangelist wrote up the story as we have it in view of the controversies of his day. It is noteworthy that the details and the point of the apologetic require a Jewish background.

In the stories of chapter ii, which hang closely together, the style betrays the evangelist: *ἀναγολαί, παραγίνεσθαι, προσκυνεῖν, συνάγειν, λαός*, especially in dependence on words like *ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς, καλεῖν, φαίνεσθαι, πέμπειν, πορεύεσθαι, ἐξετάζειν, εὑρίσκειν, ἀπαγγέλλειν, ἐπάνω, χαίρειν, χαρά, σφόδρα, πίπτειν, προσφέρειν, χρύσος, διὰ ὅδον, ἀναχωρεῖν, ἀνοίγειν, θησαυρός, ἄγγελος κυρίου, ἐγείρειν, παραλαμβάνειν, νυκτός, ἔκει, ἔως ἄν, τότε, τελευτᾶν, φοβεῖσθαι, τὰ μέρη, κατοικεῖν*, and, of course, the formulae of quotation.¹ On the other hand, there are some peculiar elements: *πυνθάνεσθαι*, the formula of ii. 5, *ἀκριβοῦν, ἀκριβώς, ἐπάν, τελευτή, θυμοῦσθαι, ἀναιρεῖν*,

¹ *παιᾶς* does not occur in Mark. It appears in Matthew 7 (8) times. At xvii. 18 in the sense of 'child' it is inserted in a Marcan passage; in the plural, meaning 'children', it occurs at xxi. 15, a peculiar section, which seems to have been put into writing by the evangelist.

διετής, λίθανος, σμύρνα, χρηματίζειν, ἀνακάμπτειν. Some of these expressions are required by the subject-matter and the few that remain are quite outweighed by the general similarity with the style of the editor. With this agree the occasional imitations of the LXX in *ζητεῦν τὴν ψυχήν, ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω, θυμοῦθαι,* and *ἀναιρεῖν.*

On the other hand, the quotations at vv. 6, 15, 18, 23 are independent both of LXX and M.T., that at ver. 23 being indeed quite untraceable and none of the suggestions about its origin being convincing.¹ As the evangelist consistently uses the LXX, these quotations cannot come from him, but must derive from an older stage in the story. The incidents also echo various Old Testament themes, the birth of Moses and his flight from Egypt, the flight of Jeroboam to Egypt, and the allusions to the East and the Star in Num. xxiii, xxiv. These echoes show a knowledge of the LXX and so perhaps are not as old as the explicit quotations, at least in the form in which they are recorded. There are also contacts with Targum and Midrash which must belong to a Semitic background earlier than the evangelist.

It is noticeable that chapter ii provides no real Birth story. This event is dealt with almost as an aside in a genitive absolute phrase, while the story of the Magi with the succeeding incidents takes the stage. This importation provides an answer to the question: if Jesus, commonly associated with Nazareth, really belonged to Bethlehem, how came he to spend by far the greatest part of his life at Nazareth? The background for such a cavil is implied in John i. 46, vii. 52. Some of the details in the story seem also intended to answer the question, typical of the time: what reactions had the birth in the natural world? Yet the conclusion cannot be escaped that the centre of interest in the chapter had shifted and all that was required by the oldest form of the story can be recovered from vv. 1 and 23 with perhaps the quotation in ver. 6.

A comparison of the Nativity stories in Luke and Matthew reveals the following four common elements: (a) the Davidic descent of Jesus, (b) the virgin conception, (c) the birth at Bethlehem, (d) the upbringing at Nazareth. Both accounts show a tendency to associate these elements with Old Testament quotations, for example Luke i. 31, Matt. i. 23 with Isa. vii. 14 and possibly Luke i. 77, Matt. i. 21 with Ps. cxxx. 8. Such was the basis of tradition, but when it reached the evangelist it was already much enlarged, his main concern being to reduce what he received to writing. We

¹ Klostermann, 19 ad loc.; E.T. lii. 410-12.

may accordingly presume that while the evangelist used only oral tradition for the first two chapters of the Gospel, himself supplying the language and style with some of the details, the main lines of the stories and the quotations were already fixed when he took them in hand. Such a view seems to meet the requirements of the facts. As the chapters are in the evangelist's style we may infer that the evangelist had no written documents before him when he recorded the story, and with this inference the other characteristics of the narratives would not conflict.

The question why the later evangelists, the author of St. Matthew included, were not content to begin their Gospels at the same point as St. Mark chose, is one which only in part concerns our inquiry. The answer, as far as it belongs here, takes us into conceptions fundamental to the Gospel as a literary form. The early Church looked on certain events in the life of Jesus Christ as cardinal to the redemption of man. It fell to St. Mark to be the first to group these events together in a single written document, under this theological principle. In the main, the evangelists abode by the selection and the emphasis which that Gospel gives. The two principal changes, the addition of the Birth stories and the continuation of the Resurrection account, must have been due to a feeling in the early Church that these narratives were relevant to an adequate portrayal of the redemptive acts of the incarnate life. This explanation would accord with the fact that the evangelist seems to have found the bulk of his material already existing in the tradition.

Before we treat the quotations in the Gospel, we may sum up our conclusions about the four groups of material already examined. Traces of the evangelist's style have been marked. Where it was available Mark provided the skeleton on to which the various additions were built. There is a noticeable increase of the legendary and the marvellous. Apologetic and other motives of late date appear. Several examples enable us to see the various stages of construction in the development of the peculiar elements. All these facts taken together point to the conclusion that for this additional matter the editor had no written source before him. On the other hand, occasionally in the course of the Gospel and in chapters i-ii to a larger extent than elsewhere we can find traces of elements of tradition which must have been available to the evangelist apart from his written sources. This opinion, of course, leaves unsatisfied the desire to know how these traditions came to him and how much they owe to his rehandling.

The quotations differ from the other categories of material in that their ultimate source is known to us, to wit, the Old Testament. Our aim is to discover if they came to the evangelist in particular written form or not. To do this we must first consider the Greek forms in which the Old Testament would be available. We still have enough evidence before us to show that, at least for some books, more than one Greek translation was known. The Psalm of Habakkuk exists in two versions. Besides the LXX we have traces of another pre-Theodotionic translation of Daniel. *i Esdras* and the fragment in *Const. Apost.* ii. 22-3 which contains the Prayer of Manasseh are obviously the remains of a version of *Chronicles* and *Ezra-Nehemiah* independent of and probably older than our present version. Recently there have come to light papyrus fragments of the Pentateuch which differ considerably from the ordinary LXX. Pseudo-Aristeas knew of an earlier translation besides that which he commended (§§ 30, 314). In addition there are remains of a Samaritan Greek version of the Pentateuch. Nor does variety cease when we turn to the LXX itself. The quotations in the New Testament and second-century writings often go their own way. Already the text of Alexandrinus, or something very like it, was before the writer *To the Hebrews*. The Lucianic recension contains old elements and the Chester Beatty papyri give further evidence of variety. To conclude, just as to-day there are many Biblical translations in being, of varying authority and popularity, style and competence, so it was in the first century. Where a New Testament quotation differs from our LXX, it does not follow that it represents an immediate use of an Hebrew original or an Aramaic targum.

Examination of his practice has shown that the evangelist was in the main dependent on the LXX.¹ The quotations in Mark are taken, with few exceptions, from the LXX. When these quotations are taken over into Matthew, apart from xxii. 37 where Q is conflated with Mark and provides the agreement with the Hebrew, the agreement with the LXX is regularly made more exact. The inference from this is that Matthew depended as much as Mark on the LXX and, in using it, kept closer to the text. This conclusion agrees with the point to be established later, that the church in which the Gospel was produced was at that time a Greek-speaking church and that the evangelist himself was familiar only with the Greek language.

As we have not M and Q before us, we cannot argue that the

¹ W. C. Allen, *E.T.* xii. 281-5; Bacon, op. cit. 470-7.

same tendency shows itself there. It may, however, be said that the majority of the non-Markan quotations in the Gospel likewise derive from the LXX.

There is, however, a minority of which that is not true. Of these quotations some, such as v. 33, vii. 23, x. 35 f., xi. 10, may be ascribed to the written sources. There remain, however, several which cannot be so accounted for; such are i. 21, ii. 6, 15, 18, 23, iv. 15 f., viii. 17, xii. 18 ff., xiii. 35, xxi. 5, xxvii. 9 f. Further, this group of quotations is almost identical with another group introduced by a formula of citation. This second group consists of i. 23, ii. 6, 15, 18, 23, iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 18, xiii. 35, xxi. 4, xxvii. 9. The two groups can be made identical if we may presume that at some stage of the tradition the formula of introduction was transferred from i. 21 to i. 23. If this suggestion is allowed, it implies that the use of these quotations has a history behind it. In any case the conclusion is clear that, because the evangelist was himself dependent on the LXX, he must have taken over these quotations from another source which was not so dependent.

What is this other source? As five of the quotations depend on Marcan contexts, to wit iv. 14–16, viii. 17, xii. 17–21, xiii. 35, xxi. 4 f., and i. 21, 23, ii. 6, 15, 18, 23, xxvii. 9 f. depend on stories which, as we have seen, were not before the evangelist in written form, the quotations themselves can hardly be ascribed to a written document. This conclusion, however, joined to the other, that the evangelist had them from another source, points to unwritten tradition as supplying them. As we have been forced elsewhere to advance this hypothesis to account for other elements in the Gospel, it is the less improbable that this explanation is correct here also.

Our conclusion is clear. The evangelist used only three written sources, Mark, Q, and M. Besides these he was acquainted with a number of traditions existing only orally, until they were incorporated in the Gospel. With these elements are to be associated a number of quotations. In several cases the traditions and the quotations seem already to have been attached to certain contexts in the record of Mark. Likewise quotations in the Nativity stories presume the existence of these stories and the connexion of the quotations with them before the evangelist put them into writing.

It will be seen that such a result conflicts with the hypothesis of a document called N into which were frequently shepherded the parts of the Gospel which cannot be derived from Mark, Q, or M.

A glance at the proposed contents¹ shows that they lack a common character and an organic unity, such as is shown by Mark, Q, and even M. These contents are but scraps left over, and to postulate a document N to account for them shows how completely the documentary hypothesis has engrossed the minds of some scholars. None the less, in turning away from the documentary hypothesis, we are forced to ask ourselves what we really mean by the alternative that our examination of the material seems to suggest, the alternative of oral tradition.

¹ e.g. F. W. Green, *St. Matthew*, 12. Canon Green does not assert that N is a document. Bacon inclines to the N hypothesis.

THE LITURGICAL BACKGROUND

Summary. Chapter IV begins the treatment of the second factor in the production of Matthew, the circumstances. In the synagogue the regular reading of the Scriptures was followed by an expository sermon and the content of these expositions often became traditional. Much in Matthew is inexplicable by documentary criticism, but can be understood, if we assume that, before it was written, Mark, Q, and M had been read and expounded in the same way as the Old Testament in Judaism. We know that the custom of public reading and exposition was taken over, and it is conceivable that Matthew was composed to serve this purpose, being in effect a revised Gospel lectionary.

BEIDES its own contribution to the account of the origins of the Gospel, the analysis into sources makes it quite clear that certain aspects of the analysis itself can be completely understood only if the circumstances of the composition of the book are kept in mind, while other aspects cannot be understood on the documentary hypothesis at all. From this it is clear that for a satisfactory resolution of our problems we are forced to go beyond source criticism to inquire into the context in which the book was created and into the purposes that it was intended to serve.

To achieve this we must consider the uses made of the earliest Christian literature in general, with which we may rank our Gospels and such sources as Q and M. It could be employed either as propaganda outside the Church, an aim which may well have had its effect on the composition of Luke, or within the Church for both public and private edification and devotion.

The use within the Church seems to be the one intended for our Gospel. It does not show the same degree of accommodation to the needs of missionary propaganda as marks Luke. On the other hand, we must remember that the Gospels were, and were intended to be, public documents. There was no body of private readers in early Christianity, before the time of the Apologists, sufficiently large to have a literature produced primarily for it.

Next we have to ask ourselves: what is the public use within the Church which the Gospel was intended to serve? The answer is, clearly, the use in the Church's worship both for reading and exposition. To obtain a picture of what this was like we have two sources of information, Jewish practice and that of the Church.

Our first witness for Jewish practice as it existed in the period in which our Gospel came into being is the New Testament itself.

According to this an essential element of Jewish worship in the synagogues on the sabbath was the reading of the Law and the Prophets followed by an exposition or sermon. Examples of this are provided in the story of the Sermon at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16–30) and at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 14–41)¹. To these sermons the apostolic preaching, discussed by Professor Dodd,² is similar, but as it is not necessarily strictly liturgical it should not be treated as providing a close analogy.

For a later period Jewish material is plentiful in the Midrashim, the Targums, and the Talmud. As some elements have their parallels in earlier authorities such as Philo, Josephus, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and even in the Septuagint, it seems plausible to presume that a certain tradition of homiletic exposition existed in the first century and even earlier. This conclusion is supported by the fact that some of the ascriptions in our Jewish sources take us back to the same period. This, of course, does not imply that the bulk of Jewish homiletic goes back to this period, nor that the whole of the Talmud, for example, is homiletic.³

The evidence of Jewish literature confirms and fills out that of the New Testament. By the first century of our era the synagogue had acquired the outlines of a liturgy, and one of the main purposes of its services was regular instruction in religion.⁴ Of this, the kernel was the reading and exposition of Scripture as we have found it described in the New Testament.⁵ The late Dr. J. Mann, in his book *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, vol. i, has shown that there is an intimate connexion between the lections of the Palestinian Triennial Cycle and the homiletic Midrashim. Dr. Mann tried to trace this connexion back to the first century. This may be overbold, but as some of the midrashic material comes from early in the second century it is relevant for our inquiry. Dr. Mann showed that the connexion was closer between the *Yelamdenu* homilies, for example, and the prophetic lections than between these homilies and the corresponding Pentateuchal lections.⁶

¹ Cf. also 2 Cor. iii. 15, 1 Tim. iv. 13.

² Cf. also *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. v, *Additional Note*, xxxii.

³ For examples of early contacts with the later Jewish tradition cf. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, index, under the headings Midrash, Mishna, Talmud, Targum. For Josephus cf. Thackeray, *Josephus, The Man and the Historian*, 75–99; and for Philo, Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law, passim*.

⁴ Moore, *Judaism*, i. 296–307.

⁵ Elbogen, *Jüdische Gottesdienst*³, 155–205, 538–49, 590–2. There is much interesting information in *Mishnah Megillah*, edited by J. Rabbinowitz.

⁶ A convenient summary of his argument will be found at the beginning of his book or more briefly in the review of it by S. Rosenblatt in *J.B.L.* lx. 194–7.

In their expositions of Scripture the Jews recognized two types, Halakah and Haggadah. Haggadah, 'narration', came to mean the exegesis of Holy Writ for edification in a free manner. It contained stories, illustrations from life, proverbs, parables, tales, folk-lore, discussions, in fact the whole wealth of homiletic material. The text of Scripture provided a starting-point, it was often embellished with additional details which might be expanded into full-length narratives on their own. As the exposition advanced it would be buttressed by other citations from Scripture and other enrichments until the text of the sermon appeared only a kind of peg on which to hang a discourse that soon went its own luxuriant way.

Halakah, 'rule', corresponds much more to our Canon Law. It was far more systematic and exact in method and presentation than Haggadah and dealt with conduct and the practice of religion from a strictly legal point of view. This excluded the exuberant wealth and discursiveness of Haggadah. Its relation to Scripture lay in the theory of Rabbinical scholarship that all the Oral Law was to be deduced from the Written Law. Hence one of the main objects of Halakah was to derive each of the prescriptions of Oral Law from the Written Law by exegesis. Sometimes, in order to effect this purpose, the exegesis had to be very subtle and far-fetched, a feature which accentuates the connexion between Halakah and Scripture.

While Jewish scholarship distinguished between Haggadah and Halakah, in practice a sermon was not necessarily of one type or the other. In the course of exposition both types might be called into play, though of course many sermons would be described as predominantly Haggadah or Halakah.¹

A group of works midway between Scripture and exposition is to be found in the Targums. Usually, where the majority of the congregation understood Aramaic but not Hebrew, the reading of the Hebrew text was accompanied by an Aramaic version which varied between an exact translation and a loose paraphrase. Especially in their freer forms, the Targums showed contacts with Haggadah and Halakah. This is understandable, as the Targums were inextricably bound up with the reading and exposition of Scripture.

We have referred to the Midrashim for examples of an homiletic expository literature, part of which must be very ancient in date. The existence of such a literature was possible only where its

¹ Oesterley and Box, *The Literature of Rabbinical and Medieval Judaism*, 60-4; R. Travers Herford, *Talmud and Apocrypha*, 50-6, 66-9, 71-4, 109-69.

material had become largely traditional. This implies not merely the regular reading of Scripture in the synagogue, but also an exegesis of the lections which at an early period contained stock elements. Even to-day we habitually think of three Magi though their number is not given in the text. In the same way both the details and the general understanding of Scripture were coloured by an exegesis that at our period was to some degree already fixed. It was therefore inevitable that such traditional exegesis should show its traces in the Targums and, indeed, here and there in the Septuagint, just because all translation, be it free or exact, is to some extent expository.

Not only does the Greek Bible illustrate, of necessity, the close connexion between translation and exposition, but it also throws light on the way in which books came to be accepted for reading in public worship. We have good grounds for believing that most of the books of the New Testament were used in this way at an early period, but because we lack direct evidence showing how this came about, the analogy of the Septuagint is all the more instructive.

In his third Schweich lecture H. St. J. Thackeray investigated the origins of Baruch, now known to us only in the Greek. He showed how it was connected with the use of the Synagogue. The liturgical context of Baruch was the season between 17 Tammuz and the Day of Atonement. The earlier part of the book, to iii. 8, was originally written in Hebrew before A.D. 70, and later it was translated into Greek and part ii added. The introduction shows that the book was intended for liturgical use, the Syriac evidence is explicit that the Syrian Jews so used it in the Christian era, and its Greek form implies that Hellenistic Judaism also employed it in this way. Further, Thackeray pointed out the way in which Baruch takes up the theme of the Haphtaroth, or prophetic lessons, for this period. In the second half of the book iii. 9–iv. 4 is a sermon. This is important, as it indicates how the exposition of Scripture might on occasion itself become Scripture regularly used in worship in the synagogue.

Another example is the Epistle of Jeremy.¹ Originally written in Hebrew, it was an homily against idolatry, based on Jeremiah, and has some interesting parallels with the Targum of Jonathan on Jer. x. 11. In particular the work seems to be directed against the cult of Tammuz and to be intended for Tammuz 17, a fast day of

¹ H. St. J. Thackeray, *Some Aspects of the Greek Old Testament*, 54–64, and in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. Gore, *Apocrypha*, 111–16.

the synagogue. The date of the book is uncertain, but it is clear that here again an homily on Scripture has itself in time been accepted as a regular lection of public worship.

It is probable that the Prayer of Manasses had a liturgical origin. The first reference to this prayer comes in 2 Chron. xxxiii. It is also mentioned in the Apocalypse of Baruch Ixiv. 8, the Tractate Sanhedrin x. 2, and Julius Africanus. The text is preserved both in the Didascalia and in Codex Alexandrinus, where it is placed among the liturgical canticles. It is not, of course, a sermon, but provides another example of how traditional material took form and was admitted to liturgical use.

Similarly, both their own context and form, together with the fact that they were part of the LXX Daniel, suggest that the additional elements in the Greek Daniel were used in the service of the synagogue. This seems especially probable for the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children.

As the Church took over its Bible, the Septuagint, from the Greek synagogue, we may infer that the Greek Bible as a whole, together with much that we now rank as Pseudepigrapha, was in use in Hellenistic Judaism. For this to be possible, Greek-speaking synagogues must have enjoyed a much greater freedom in what was read and expounded than obtained in later Judaism.

This freedom must be distinguished from the public reading of occasional communications. Letters were read in synagogues at the relevant places just as they are to-day in Christian worship, but this *ad hoc* use of an ephemeral epistle is quite different from the regular and frequent use of books in the service of the synagogue or church. Of course, a transition from the one usage to the other was made with the Pauline epistles, which in intention were occasional but in practice came early into constant use. Incidentally it may be suggested that pseudonymity was frequently employed as a device to guarantee that a book would at once be taken into the public use of the synagogue or church.

This survey of Jewish practice makes certain things clear. Instruction through the reading of Scripture and its exposition played an important part in the synagogue. The range of works that might be read was, especially among Greek-speaking Jews, very wide. Exposition, which followed the two main types of Haggadah and Halakah, tended to become fixed, and either provided a settled context in which the text in its main lines and details was reinterpreted, or else itself became part of the regular reading of the synagogue. We have, then, to take note both of a

considerable freedom in what was read and also of a very close connexion and interplay between lection and exposition which manifested itself in a variety of results.

The practice of the early Church seems to have been similar. The reading of Scripture, followed by an expository homily, was a regular and important part of Christian worship. The New Testament indicates that Christians of the Apostolic Age were at home with the practice of the synagogue in this matter, and the later authorities show it to be well established in Christian custom.

The earliest explicit witness to this is Justin (*Apol.* I. lxvii. 3 f.): *τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστολῶν η̄ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρι ἐγχωρεῖ. εἴτα πανσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, δὸς προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται.* The date of the first *Apology* is about A.D. 152. Justin describes the custom as if it were long established and no novelty.

The fragment of Dionysius of Corinth's letter to Soter of Rome (*Eus. H.E.* iv. 23) implies that i Clement was frequently read at this time (c. A.D. 170) at Corinth: *ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ ταύτῃ (sc. τῇ ἐπιστολῇ) καὶ τῆς Κλήμεντος πρὸς Κορινθίους μέμνηται ἐπιστολῆς, δηλῶν ἀνέκαθεν ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἀναγνωσιν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι· λέγει γοῦν “τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἀγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν ἐν τῇ ἀνέγνωμεν ὅμῳ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἣν ἔξομεν ἀεὶ ποτε ἀναγινώσκοντες νουθεῖσθαι ὡς καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἡμῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαν.”* From this it is clear that the custom of reading Scripture in church existed at Corinth, probably from the date of i Clement, if not earlier.¹

The choice of books was not limited to the Bible. The Muratorian canon appears to be a list of books which might be read in church. It allows an *Apocalypse* of Peter and the *Shepherd of Hermas* to be used. Rufinus, too, was aware of the use of *Hermas* as well as of the *Didache*:² ‘In Nono uero Testamento libellus qui dicitur Pastoris siue Hermae (et is) qui appellatur Duae Viae uel Iudicium secundum Petrum. Quae omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis uoluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam’ (*in symb. Apost.* 38). Of Polycarp's epistle Jerome wrote: ‘Scripsit ad Philippenses ualde utilem epistolam quae usque hodie in Asiae conuentu legitur’ (*de Vir. Illustr.* 17). Polycarp himself implies³ that the collection of Ignatius'⁴ letters sent to *Philippi* was intended for reading in church.

¹ 2 Clement, whatever its date and place, refers to ‘the reader’, xix. 1.

² *The Didache* may itself refer to readings, xvi. 2.

³ *ad Phil.* 13.

⁴ Ignatius has a reference to teaching, *ad Polyc.* v. 1.

The custom of reading the Fathers, the Acts of Martyrs, the lives of Saints, monastic rules, and other treatises, which obtained in later practice, especially in Mattins, seems to have been but the adaptation and survival of an earlier liberty which the Church allowed itself in reading whatever was found to be edifying. Some books earlier read were later rejected. For example, the Gospel of Peter which had been read at Rhossus was condemned by Serapion of Antioch (c. A.D. 200).¹

These facts show how firmly established was the practice of reading and preaching from Holy Writ and other books in the second century. Indeed, it may be said that, apart from Papias, Hegesippus, and the Apologists, almost the whole of Christian literature before Irenaeus which has survived was used for reading in the services of the Church. Probably the survival itself was due to this practice, and as long as a document continued to be read publicly its existence was guaranteed, but as soon as it disappeared from the worship of the Church it was in grave danger of being lost.

The evidence also shows that the Church, just as much as the Hellenistic synagogue, practised a considerable liberty in deciding what was to be read, and much that was later rejected from the Canon of Scripture was read without any qualms at an earlier date. Indeed, an apostolic name was not regarded as necessary to commend a book to the ears of the faithful, and the epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, as well as the Shepherd of Hermas, were accepted, though their true authors were known. On the other hand, 2 Peter, Barnabas, the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter show by their ascriptions that the value of an apostolic name was realized.

It is easy to understand how, in these conditions, the Church came to create and employ continuously a literature of its own to proclaim in its worship its message and teaching in explicit terms. The transition from ephemeral to regular reading that must have happened with the epistles, the considerable laxity that obtained until a variety of causes restricted this freedom, the way in which the whole practice is taken for granted, indicate both the assured character of the custom itself and the period of change in which it was taken over from Judaism by the early Church, together with so much else of its institutional life.

About the sermon we are less well informed. We do not possess, from the time before Origen, a Christian homiletic literature anything like that of Judaism. The Homily on the Passion of Melito of Sardis is our only certain example from an earlier period. It has

¹ Eus. *H.E.* vi. 12.

indeed been suggested that some of the documents traditionally reckoned as epistles are really sermons, as for example Hebrews, Barnabas, and 2 Clement. However this may be, it is at any rate true that the epistle differed very little sometimes from the expository sermon and fulfilled a similar purpose. It is certain, too, that from the time of Melito of Sardis there was a traditional homiletic exegesis which may indeed be older still.

With this agree any elements of truth that may lie in the theory of a book of testimonies. It is improbable that Rendel Harris's theory is sound, but while the earliest known testimony books came from Tertullian and Cyprian, collections of this kind may be older than they, and a traditional apologetic exposition of selected texts of Scripture must be older still. This implies the existence of a common stock of exegesis at an early date. It is indeed only on some such hypothesis that we can explain the coincidence whereby Zech. ix. 9 is independently quoted in both Matthew and John for the entry into Jerusalem.¹ This, of course, need not imply that the Christians of the first century had a testimony book apart from the Greek Bible itself. More truly it could be said that this was their testimony book and that, apart from the general view that Scripture *in toto et in partibus* was fulfilled in our Lord already, homiletic exposition was accustomed to use certain quotations from the Old Testament regularly in connexion with certain events of the Gospel story. Beyond the existence of the Bible and a certain theory about it, this view requires no more than the homiletic context.

The evidence and implications of the later Christian tradition seem to be borne out by both the assumptions and the conclusions of Formgeschichte.² This method of investigation maintains that, before it was fixed in the Gospels, the gospel material had an history which can be recovered by investigating the *Sitz im Leben* of this material or the context of its tradition. There are two aspects of this investigation which are held to fit together to provide the complete picture of this process. On the one hand, the study of the material as it appears in our Gospels suggests certain conclusions about its history. On the other hand, we have to re-create in imagination the practice and needs of the early Church which determined this history. These have been discovered in its life, its missionary, didactic, apologetic, and legislative action as well as in its liturgy.

¹ Matt. xxi. 1-9, John xii. 12-16.

² Cf. E. F. Scott, *The Validity of the Gospel Record*, chap. iii.

It has been increasingly recognized that certain elements in the Gospels owe their form and structure largely to their use in the Church's liturgy. For example, we have the Passion story, which is exceptional in being by far the longest continuous narrative deriving its continuity from the period before the written documents. This peculiarity appears to be due to the liturgical use of the narrative of the Passion. The suggestion has considerable probability in that it is most unlikely that, especially at the Eucharist, the Church would fail to tell anew the story of the Passion. Most ancient liturgies also employed at a later place in the service the words of institution and it has been suggested that the version of them in Matthew shows traces of this.¹

What degree of importance we ought to ascribe to the liturgical factor is hard to decide. The use in the liturgy was the most universal, as it reached both the members of the Church and interested pagans. In contrast to this, the other activities in which the gospel material found a use were limited and departmental. This is clearly true of the employment of the Gospel in missionary work, in the instruction of the interested and the catechumens, in its controversial activities, and in its task of building up a corporate rule and law. Further, in the liturgical use of Scripture these other aspects of the Church's use of the material were focused. The combination of reading and sermon permitted a missionary turn to be given to the practice, or an instructional or a controversial or a legislative. It is for reasons of this kind that we may feel justified in ascribing the greatest importance to the liturgical practice of the Church in the early history of the gospel material.

None the less, it is not always easy to determine whether a certain unit in the gospel story shows signs of liturgical rather than, for example, missionary employment. Here and there, a feature of the story points to a definite conclusion, as when the addition of a quotation from the Old Testament indicates use within the Church rather than without. In the Graeco-Roman world, apart from the Church and Judaism, a quotation from the pagan writers, Homer for example or Plato, would be much more cogent. Indeed, we find traces of this line of argument in the Apologists and later writers.

Nor must the liturgical use be regarded as, in practice, the only, as well as the major, determinant. The Church could not preach the gospel to the world without using, in its preaching, the gospel story. Likewise we can see from the Didache, how it was adapted to the needs of those under instruction. Controversy, too, and

¹ Lohmeyer, *Theologische Rundschau*, 1937, 176-7.

legislative action would also play an independent part. Hence, while we may readily agree that the Church used the gospel material for a variety of purposes, and while we are not always able to identify the purpose of employment which has dictated the form of even the survival of much gospel material, yet we are not to succumb without further ado to the temptation to treat the liturgy as the only formative influence.

With these cautions, it may be seen that *Formgeschichte* by its implications confirms the evidence of the early Christian traditions on the liturgical custom of the Church. Taken together with this evidence it enables us to realize something of the importance and character of this custom for our problem, and also gives convincing arguments for its antiquity.

These indications encourage us to take up the next part of our task. This is, by combining the evidence about later Christian and contemporary Jewish practice, to furnish a picture of what the liturgical background was against which the Gospel according to St. Matthew came into being. This combination is made the easier by the fact that the custom of reading and expounding Scripture in the Church was but the continuation within Christianity of the practice of the synagogue. For this reason the general agreement of the evidence from the two sides of Jewish and later Christian practice should not cause any surprise.

The Christians, as soon as they began to order a form of worship of their own, would take over the regular reading of Scripture and the exposition of it. In what they chose to read they would enjoy the same freedom as we know obtained in Hellenistic Judaism and in later Christianity. This latitude would give them the opportunity of introducing into their reading a Christian element. It may well be that at the earliest stage something from the evangelical tradition was narrated, without reference to a written record, and indeed before a written record came into being. Soon a change would be introduced as the Church passed from the ephemeral use of the epistle to its regular use. Probably about the same period came the appearance of the first written evangelical records, which in turn gave place to more comprehensive documents like *Q*, and documents both more comprehensive and organically more developed, such as our earliest Gospel, *Mark*.

Throughout the period in which these developments took place, and afterwards, the sermon followed the reading, and both depended and reacted on it. The dependence is clear, as the subject-matter of what was read determined to a large extent the main

themes of the following exposition. The reaction of this exposition was probably along such lines as these. As such documents as Mark, Q, and M were repeatedly read in Church over some twenty years there was bound to develop a fixed element in exposition along the lines of Haggadah and Halakah. The more fixed it became, the more it determined that the lections so often expounded should be understood in a certain way.

This may be illustrated by an example already cited. The story of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem was first told as it appears in Mark xi. 1-10. Next, in exposition, Zech. ix. 9 was regularly quoted as foretelling this event and being fulfilled in it, and was accordingly introduced at Matt. xxi. 5 and John xii. 15. Finally, the quotation reacts on the text at Matt. xxi, where the foal of the other Gospels becomes an ass and a foal, because both are apparently mentioned in Zechariah.

This reaction of exposition on the lections opened the way to various recastings of the gospel material. Before this material was committed to writing the recasting of the tradition was easy at any moment. After the appearance of written documents it was possible in any degree only in such re-editions of the documents as we have in Matthew and Luke. Later liturgical revision could leave its traces only in the uncanonical gospels and in the creation of textual variants. Liturgical practice was probably a factor in the textual history of the end of Mark and of John vii. 53-viii. 11.

To give undue importance, however, to the influence of the liturgy on the development of the Gospels would be to fall into the same error as that made by those who have tried to explain the origins of the Gospels almost entirely by the documentary hypothesis, helped out by the vagaries of editorial activity. In trying to allow for the contribution of the third element, the context in which the Gospels came into being, the attempt must be made to hold the balance true between all three.

We now have the task of trying to discover how far this third factor accounts for the origins of the Gospel. Related to this task is the need to decide how far the liturgical context of the Gospel corresponds, for our purpose, to this third factor of context as a whole. Can we feel that, when we have investigated the traces of liturgical influence in our Gospel, we have satisfied ourselves about the part that the Christian background played in its creation? The answer to this problem has been suggested in part when we found that the documentary hypothesis failed to explain certain features laid bare by the analysis of the text. In so far as the context does

explain these features, it assists us to meet the difficulty. The other part of the answer lies in an appeal to the evidence, already cited, on the important part played by reading and exposition in the service and life of the Church in general. Instruction played an outstanding part largely through the forms and practices provided by the Christian liturgy.

If the suggestions of liturgical practice are combined with the conclusions of our source analysis, the background in which the Gospel came into being may be reconstructed as follows. Let us assume that the Church in which it was composed had long read Mark, Q, and M in public worship. How long this use may have lasted we do not know, but a suggestion may be made. Mark may be dated *c.* A.D. 65 and Q probably is as old, if not older. For M we have no date. If Matthew was composed about A.D. 90-100, it means that Mark and Q and possibly M may well have been in use for twenty years before this. This conclusion is important because the longer Mark, Q, and M had been read and expounded the greater was the chance for the development of a fixed element in the exposition and for the appearance of an understanding of the lections modified according to this exposition.

At the end of this period Matthew was written as a kind of revised gospel book, conveniently incorporating into one volume the three documents Mark, Q, and M. It was natural that, in a revised gospel book produced for the worship of the Church, the needs and convenience of liturgical practice should be consulted. This was necessary since Mark, for example, for all its excellences, is not an ideal book for liturgical use.

As a revised gospel book it would also show the influence of some twenty years' exposition of its sources. In particular the use of quotations, the grouping of material, and rephrasing would be consequent upon this activity. Some of the changes are only in matters of detail, but the results as a whole are considerable.

Further, as a revised book, Matthew would be intended to supersede the three sources in public use. This intention succeeded in so far as two of them have completely disappeared leaving no sure trace or record outside the Gospels themselves. To achieve this end the evangelist had to include in his book the bulk of his sources. To have excluded large sections of one would have left that source still indispensable.

Other consequences of this thesis that Matthew is a revised gospel book will come to light as the thesis itself is tested by the evidence. The important thing, once the thesis has been advanced,

is to discover how far it provides a satisfactory explanation of features which cannot be explained by source criticism or by a reference to editorial activity, and how far other features come to light which accord with our liturgical hypothesis.

It will also be necessary to see what other theories have been advanced to account for the facts. For example, it has been suggested that the main purpose of the Gospel was to be a kind of catechist's manual. To determine the issue we shall have to show that the one explanation is either in itself improbable, or else does not provide so satisfactory an account of the book as another theory.

The problem of discrimination between the three factors in the composition of the book, which has already been noticed, will have to come up for review, once the nature of the context of the Gospel has been decided. It will be especially difficult to attribute the right degree of importance to the personality of the evangelist. In a sense this is the primary factor, as through him the *Sitz im Leben* exercises its influence, and it is his judgement which determines the treatment of the sources and the fate of other constituent elements. The process of discrimination will itself give us also an opportunity of reconsidering some aspects of our documentary hypothesis.

It was noted earlier that the liturgical activity of the Church was a kind of focus for its other activities. Once it has been realized that these other activities reacted on the gospel material through the medium of the exposition, we can see how the text of our Gospel provides evidence for the institutions, activities, and contacts of the Christian community, especially where we have the text of Mark to compare with Matthew. Here each change has to be scrutinized to discover its purpose and to see what light it may throw on the life of the Church. In Q, too, we have the parallel passages of Luke, and from them we can sometimes learn where the evangelist has altered his original and his reason for doing so, especially where there are analogies in his revision of Mark.

From this it can be seen that the examination of the liturgical hypothesis is not the end of the inquiry. It may advance us on the road to understanding the origins of our book, but before we can press on we have to test the theory itself.

V

THE LITURGICAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPEL

Summary. Several features of Matthew would support the suggestion that it was written to be read liturgically. The stylistic changes from Mark increase lucidity. Unnecessary and distracting details are omitted. The additions make the passages easier to follow. Antithesis and parallelism are introduced, repetition of formulae is common, and the phrasing is carefully balanced and rounded.

Some scholars have indicated liturgical features in Matthew, but others have asserted that the main purpose of the Gospel is catechetical. This view ignores or conflicts with several of its characteristics.

The influence of previous homiletic exposition can be seen in the history of various passages, in the doublets and quotations, the background of oral tradition, and the grouping of material. The evangelist's intention that the book should be read and expounded in worship was amply fulfilled in its later history.

WHEN we turn, with the liturgical context in mind, to the Gospel itself to see if it contains liturgical features, we have at once to face the difficulty that the evangelist has left no statement of his intentions. Hence, in our attempt to divine them, we have to rely on indirect evidence alone. We hope that we have shown in the last chapter that external evidence, though it laboured under a like difficulty of silence, indicated that the liturgical factor was an important one at this period in the Church and in the formation of its literature. In this chapter the internal evidence is to be examined to see how far it too may point to a liturgical purpose, in particular in those features which the documentary hypothesis fails of itself to explain adequately.

First we will examine the strictly liturgical as distinct from the homiletic elements in the Gospel, noting features of style and arrangement. If a book is written with the intention of being read aloud in church, it will require a lucidity greater than that requisite in a book intended principally for private use. Much that could otherwise be left to the readers' understanding has to be made explicit for an audience, while on the other hand all unessential details are best away, as they burden and perhaps overburden the hearers' attention. Of both these tendencies we may find traces in our Gospel, especially in the evangelist's rewriting of St. Mark.

As a beginning we may take some examples of the tendency to

abbreviate.¹ Matt. viii. 1-4 repeats Mark i. 40-4, but is only about two-thirds the length of the Marcan original. Some of the omissions, such as those of ὅργισθεῖς (so read for σπλαγχνισθεῖς with D, a, ff², r, Ephr.), Mark i. 41, καὶ ἐμβρυμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν, i. 43, are to be explained as due to the content of these expressions, but the shortening of the narrative as a whole makes it easier to follow. Likewise in Matt. viii. 18, 23-7 from Mark iv. 35-41 a number of details disappear. Jesus' position in the boat, given in Mark iv. 38, is not mentioned in Matthew. The rebuke to the sea and the wind also is shortened, but reasons of content may have determined the omission of Mark iv. 40. The story of the Gadarene demoniac is further reduced. In Matthew it is reproduced in 136 words but in Mark it takes 325. Instead of the Marcan fullness of detail we have in Matthew the main points of the story only. Mark v. 4-5, 8-10, 16, 18-20 are omitted without any equivalent in Matthew and other verses are considerably shortened. The same is true of Matt. ix. 18-26, where the detail of Mark is largely omitted. Here abbreviation reaches its maximum, the story in Matthew being only 36 per cent. of its size in Mark. We may also compare Matt. xiv. 13-21 with Mark vi. 30-44, Matt. xvii. 14-21 with Mark ix. 14-29, Matt. xx. 29-34 with Mark x. 46-52, Matt. xxvi. 17-19 with Mark xiv. 12-16. Taking these stories together we find that Mark tells them in 1,840 words, Luke in 1,476, and Matthew in 971. Matthew consistently reduces the length of the Marcan narrative and usually reduces it more drastically than Luke, who on two occasions expands it. Only a proportion of the omissions can be accounted for on the supposition that the evangelist objected to the substance of the passages he omitted or abbreviated. If, however, we take into account the requirements of liturgical use, we have a possible reason why Matthew reduces the Marcan text more frequently and drastically than does Luke.

The same process may be seen in the following sections:

Matt. xiii. 54-8 beside Mark vi. 1-6.

Matt. xiv. 3-5 beside Mark vi. 17-20.

Matt. xiv. 6-12 beside Mark vi. 21-9.

Matt. xiv. 34-6 beside Mark vi. 53-6.

Matt. xxi. 18-20 beside Mark xi. 12-14, 20 f.

Here we have no comparable Lucan parallels (Luke iv. 16-30 is not close enough to be taken into account) but the work of abbreviation is just as thorough, Matthew using 329 words in these sections where Mark has 519, though the main lines of the stories are in no

¹ Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*², 158-60.

wise obscured. Here, again, the shortening of Mark can be explained on liturgical grounds.¹

But in his rewriting of his material the evangelist adds as well as omits. For some of his additions particular reasons are available, others can be explained only as being due to a desire to make the story clearer or easier to follow. Of this we may give several examples. In the story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mark vi. 30-44, Matt. xiv. 13-21) we may note these additions: at ver. 16 οὐ χρείαν ἔχοντων ἀπελθεῖν and the whole of ver. 18. They add nothing to the story except that they make the sequence and connexion a little more explicit. At xii. 2 ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ is added and again merely resumes the main point of the story. The repetition of vii. 16 at vii. 20 and of xiii. 10 at xiii. 13 makes only for clearness. At xx. 23 the addition of ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου does but make explicit an implication of the story. The addition of καὶ ἔστρωσαν ἐν τῇ δόῳ at the end of xxi. 8 may appear clumsy to us, but would perhaps make the order of events easier to follow for a congregation. Likewise, Mark has nothing in his text corresponding to καὶ ηὐλίσθη ἐκεῖ, Matt. xxi. 17. What is left to the imagination in Mark is filled out in Matthew. The same is true of xxi. 25, πόθεν ἦν, of xxi. 35, οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, and xxii. 17, εἰπον οὖν ἡμῖν, τί σοι δοκεῖ; ὁ Ἰησοῦς is often added, especially at the beginning of a paragraph as at xvii. 22 compared with Mark ix. 30 and xviii. 1 compared with Mark ix. 33.

Other changes may be intended to serve the same purpose. At xix. 17-18 we have question and answer introduced. This may be done for reasons partly depending on the context of the passage. For example, it may be desired to emphasize the importance of the commandments or certain of them in the godly life. But at xii. 10, xiii. 10, xv. 15, xvi. 22, direct speech is introduced by the evangelist. This practice may to some extent be followed to direct the attention of an audience to points which it is desired to emphasize or at any rate prevent being forgotten. This, of course, need not prevent passages where this feature occurs from serving other purposes as well. We have already seen that xiv. 18 has a value as making a connexion in the narrative while xv. 15 leads up to the important conclusion of the story. xii. 10 underlines the point of dispute and xiii. 10 serves to lead up to the explanation of the use of parables. At xvi. 22 the evangelist is able to moderate Peter's

¹ For smaller omissions cf. Allen, *St. Matthew*, xxiv f. Early Jewish evidence for the shortening of liturgical lessons will be found in J. Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, i. 9.

rebuke and give it a respectful tone by putting it into words. Accordingly the change may be reckoned to have been made in this passage mainly for reasons of substance. But, in whatever way we may try to explain this appearance of direct speech in the evangelist's revision of Mark, it cannot be fortuitous as the direct speech of Mark is frequently suppressed in Matthew. For this suppression we may compare Mark iv. 39 with Matt. viii. 26. The conversations of Mark v. 8-10, 18-20, 30-3, 35 f., are not reproduced and for similar treatment we may compare Mark vi. 31 and ix. 16.

Another device the evangelist employs is structural. He presents his material in a more satisfying and memorable form by giving it a carefully balanced and rounded phrasing. His use of antithesis and parallelism are frequently to be noted as serving this end. For parallelism we may point to vi. 13 beside Luke xi. 4, where only the first clause is present. For a more fully developed example of parallelism v. 38-42, compared with Luke vi. 29 f., may be cited. In vi. 19-21 he introduces his favourite antithesis of heaven and earth. It is absent in the Lucan equivalent, xii. 33 f. We may find further examples of these structural peculiarities at vii. 13 f. (Luke xiii. 23 f.), vii. 21-3 (Luke vi. 46, xiii. 26 f.), x. 37 f. (Luke xiv. 26 f.), xi. 20-4 (Luke x. 13-15). In Matt. xxiii repetition of structure and formulae narrowly escapes becoming tedious. To some extent the evangelist avoids this by varying the form.

The repetition of formulae, just mentioned, may have a liturgical purpose. In most books of public worship a certain recurrence of phrase and wording is noticeable. Examples may easily be found in the Book of Common Prayer. At Matt. iii. 7 (Luke iii. 7) occurs the expression *γεννήματα ἔχοντων* followed by a question. Here the wording comes from Q but at xii. 34 and xxiii. 33 the evangelist seems to have intruded the words with the question that follows them. The closing formula *ἔκεινοι εἰσται οἱ κλαυθμὸς καὶ οἱ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων* occurs once in Q, Matt. viii. 12 (Luke xiii. 28), but is repeated at Matt. xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, xxv. 30 by the editor of the Gospel, apparently without warrant from the sources. Again at vii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, xxvi. 1, we find a type of formula used to close each of the five main central divisions of the Gospel. The formulae of this type, while they are not identical, are similar. We have already noticed a tendency to produce a uniformity in the introductions to the parables of the Kingdom. Here, however, we cannot certainly distinguish between what comes from the evangelist and what he owes to his sources. xix. 30 is reproduced at xx. 16, but here another cause may be

operative. xxvii. 64, ἔσται ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης, recalls xii. 45, γίνεται τὰ ἐσχάτα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων (Luke xi. 26).¹

Other changes of style take place.² The crudities and irregularities of Mark's Greek are removed, while often a more unexceptionable vocabulary replaces the undignified words of the earlier Gospel. By the side of Matthew, Luke's version of Q frequently seems abrupt and staccato, and we may imagine that here also a considerable stylistic and verbal improvement has been made. The result is to produce a smooth style which none the less impresses itself easily on the memory. While such a result would not of itself argue a liturgical purpose, it would, granted such a purpose, accord well with it.

Something of the evangelist's conservatism may be due to the same cause. While in liturgy changes are continually made even in trivialities, they must not be too abrupt lest they disturb the congregations and 'the old, they say, is better'. The story of the uproar in an African church, when the Vulgate was first introduced there, over Jerome's use of *cucumbita* instead of the old Latin *hedera* in the story of Jonah shows how a measure of restraint is necessary in liturgical innovation. This fact would commend also the evangelist's use as recurrent formulae of clauses and phrases already known to the congregation. In the same way, despite omissions and alterations, he often tells a story with but little change from the Marcan wording. Thus Mark xii. 15, τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, disappears, but instead at Matt. xxii. 18 we have ὑποκριταί. Mark x. 21, ἐν σε ὑστερεῖ, is not reproduced but Matt. xix. 20 adds τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ and Mark vi. 2, πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα, is found at Matt. xiii. 56, πόθεν οὖν τούτῳ ταῦτα πάντα. Mark i. 14 is more exactly reproduced not at Matt. iv. 17 but at iv. 23 and Mark iv. 25 not at Matt. xiii. 24 but at xiii. 12. A similar conservatism may be seen in the evangelist's handling of the substance of his material. He frequently refrains from going to extremes in an attempt to make it consistent. v. 17–20 is a group of sayings referring to the same topic but not in agreement among themselves. In the parable xxv. 1–13 the story does not really harmonize with its application in vv. 11–13, vii. 6 does not well agree with vii. 1–5 and least with vii. 1. Likewise at xxi. 10–17 the narrative is not consistent, but the evangelist has not removed the inconsistency.

The reception that the book received at the hands of the Church

¹ Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 168–73.

² Allen, *St. Matthew*, xix–xxx; C. H. Turner, *J.T.S.* xxv–xxix, articles on Marcan usage.

would agree with the view that in his revision of his sources the author of the Gospel intended to produce a work more acceptable to the Church's liturgical use. If we compare the citations from Matthew with those from the other Gospels, in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine for example, it is seen to be the most popular of the four. The tendency was, other things being equal, to prefer the Matthean version wherever it was available. Two examples of this may be indicated. The Matthean form of the Lord's Prayer is deservedly the form that has established itself in the Church's liturgical use.¹ The form of the Beatitudes, also, which is usually quoted, is that in our Gospel. Indeed, so successful was it as a revision of Mark, that Mark dropped almost completely out of use, and it is only modern scholarship, with its interest in the historical and the primitive, which has rescued Mark from this neglect. If Matthew is usually the most quoted of the Gospels in the Fathers, Mark is regularly and by far the least quoted.

The preceding arguments should provide some internal support for the thesis that the Gospel was intended primarily to serve a liturgical purpose. Recognition of the liturgical features of the Gospel has once or twice been made in the work of modern scholars. E. Lohmeyer, whose commentary on Matthew has apparently not yet appeared, refers to this character;² treating of the changes in Matthew from the Marcan text he writes against certain explanations of the addition of *πάρες*, Matt. xxvi. 27: 'Aber Mt hat die Bemerkung des Mk anders verstanden; er las wohl daraus eine in erzählende Form gekleidete liturgische Regel, weshalb er sie in direkte Worte umsetzte.' Later, on the addition of *δὲ Ιησοῦς*, Matt. xxvi. 26, he proceeds, 'Oder weshalb fügt Mt nicht nur *δὲ Ιησοῦς* sondern auch *τοῖς μαθηταῖς* ein? Der Bericht scheint nun wie von neuem anzuheben; und weshalb an dieser Stelle? Liturgischer Stil bestimmt die Fassung des Mt; und was aus sich heraus zu vermuten ist, wird so wahrscheinlicher: bei Mt liegt die Tradition der Abendmahlsworte vor, die die Feier seiner Gemeinde tragen.'³ M. Dibelius, in his book *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 45, on Matt. vi. 25–34, has the following remark: 'Matthew, probably in accordance with the religious language of his communities, prefers the more liturgical expressions like the "birds of the air"; Luke uses the more realistic form of phrase and has Jesus speak of the "ravens".'

¹ Cf. *The Study of Theology*, 413: 'Again the Lord's Prayer in the Matthean text has the appearance of being arranged for liturgical recitation.'

² *Theologische Rundschau*, 1937, 176.

³ *Ibid.* 177.

We ought at this point to recall that other theories have been advanced on the purpose of the book. Even Bacon, who could refer to the practice of targumming the Gospel,¹ never treated contemporary liturgical custom as an important element in its production. More commonly it has been suggested that the Gospel was intended to serve a catechetical purpose, and it might be argued that the evidence which might seem to indicate a liturgical purpose would indicate equally well a didactic one. Before we continue with our exploration of the liturgical background we must deal further with this alternative suggestion.

First we must note some of the resemblances and differences between the two purposes advanced as accounting for some of the peculiarities of our Gospel. Both would aim at instruction. In the Church's worship this would be achieved by the reading of the Gospel, as of the other lessons, followed by an expository homily. Catechetically this would be effected by the instruction of catechumens and those interested. Further, a gospel which successfully served a liturgical purpose would probably have a certain value as a catechetical document. It is not so certain that the converse is true. 'The Apostolic Tradition' of Hippolytus, useful as it obviously is for conveying information, is much less satisfactory for use in Church services. There is a further difference between the two types of use. A book intended for the liturgy of the Church could only be used in this way if it were given official approval. To be successful it would have to become a public document. On the other hand, a catechetical work, provided that it led to no ill results, need never attract official notice at all. Its use would be much more private and informal.

The Gospel has been rightly called a revised edition of Mark, and it certainly succeeded in displacing the earlier work. It would indeed be surprising, if, at the time when Matthew was composed, Mark had not been used liturgically for some years. But, if it was so used, it is most unlikely that a writer would have produced a revised edition of it to take its place in catechetical use only. Far from being content to provide a manual for informal instruction he would aim at producing a book for the worship of the Church, and, having ousted Mark there, he could be sure that his work would everywhere replace the earlier Gospel.

This is borne out by a study of the grouping and rewriting of the material which seem to suggest that the Gospel, far from containing material mainly relevant to the needs of inquirers and cate-

¹ Op. cit. 21-3.

chumens, has direction suitable for all classes within the Church. For example, much of Matt. xviii, as it stands, is intended for the leaders of the community rather than those on its threshold; the warning in xviii. 1-5 against seeking greatness, in vv. 6-9 against causing the 'little ones', probably the ordinary believers, to stumble, would be especially apposite to those in authority. They would have to be warned against despising those in their charge, ver. 10. To them especially would belong the recovery of the lost, vv. 11-14. Reconciliation and discipline would be their particular concern, vv. 15-22. To them the warning to exercise their office with clemency would be most appropriate. These would be counsels for the elder in the Church rather than the beginner. Likewise the directions of ix. 35-xi. 1 are, at any rate in part, a message to the Christian evangelist over and above the rank and file of the faithful. We may look at the sayings of ix. 37 f. The beginning of chapter x shows that the discourse is directed to the twelve who are given authority. They are told how to conduct themselves and what reception they may expect, ver. 14 shows that they are expected to preach, and ver. 25 implies that the disciple who is to become himself a teacher is in mind. The command to preach appears in ver. 27. Verses 40-1 suggest that the evangelist rather than the catechumen is being addressed. We may conclude that, just as Matt. xviii was addressed to the Church authorities, so Matt. ix. 35-xi. 1 is addressed to the Christian evangelist and teacher. We have seen how the Petrine stories are frequently associated with the giving of a ruling on what must have been a disputed issue in the Church in our period or a little earlier. Such elements in the Gospel would be of major moment to Christians of standing, but of little immediate interest to catechumens. Accordingly we may infer from the passages referred to that the book has a much wider audience in view than the catechumenate.

This argument is reinforced if we compare our Gospel with the Didache, which is generally regarded as a kind of handbook for beginners. This is obviously not intended to be a substitute for the Gospels, but it does select and underline material which would be of first importance for the instruction of converts. It aims at giving simple moral instruction and rules for conduct together with explanations of some of the Church's institutions. On the other hand, the Gospel narrative and much of the less relevant teaching is absent. The Gospel, however, while it contains much of value for converts as well as for others, is not determined by any merely sectional interest.

Another piece of evidence may point the same way. If the Gospel were intended first of all for the teaching of converts, we should expect that the teaching activity of our Lord and the Church would be emphasized. We do not find this. Out of Mark's 17 examples of διδάσκειν Matthew reproduces 7. At Luke xi. 1, xii. 12, xiii. 22, 26, διδάσκειν occurs in Q contexts but it does not appear in the corresponding verses in Matthew.¹ Apart from xxi. 23, where διδάσκοντι should be omitted, διδάσκειν occurs 13 times in the Gospel and 17 times in Luke, and διδαχή occurs 5 times in Mark, thrice in Matthew (two of these occurrences being derived from Mark), once in Luke. διδάσκαλος occurs 12 times in Matthew (11 times if διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν, ix. 11, is to be omitted with *a*, *k*, *syr.* *sin.*), 12 times in Mark, 16 times in Luke. διδασκαλία occurs once in a passage, xv. 9, derived from Mark vii. 7, quoting Isa. xxix. 13 and does not appear elsewhere in the Gospels. We cannot conclude from these statistics that the evangelist was not interested in teaching, but taken by themselves they do not yield evidence that he was.

The various considerations advanced in the previous paragraphs, taken together, seem to make the hypothesis that the Gospel was written for the instruction of converts appear less satisfactory than the suggestion of a liturgical purpose. It would also fail to account for the traces of homiletic use in the Gospel, both those traces which imply that some of the Gospel material had already an homiletic background and those which suggest that the book was composed with an eye to future homiletic use. It is to these traces of the sermon that we will now turn.

First to be examined are the characteristics of the Gospel which point to an homiletic use of the materials incorporated in it before they came to the evangelist. Among these we may notice a number of passages where our analysis of the text suggested that their substance was in existence before they were incorporated in the Gospel.

For example, at xxi. 10–17 there is reason to suppose that there were several earlier stages in the tradition of the two incidents recorded, stages subsequent, however, to their appearance in the Marcan record. The last stage is represented by the insertion of ver. 12 f. between ver. 10 f. and vv. 14–16. When we omit this inserted passage the verses that remain describe the reaction of the

¹ Matt. xi. 1, διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν κηρύσσειν καὶ διδάσκειν, *d*, *k*, *pesh.* (1 ms.), *arm.*: κηρύσσειν, 517, 1188, 1424, 1675, 1 260. Only the paucity of evidence is against the omission of διδάσκειν as intruded from iv. 23, vii. 29, ix. 35.

city populace and the temple authorities to the Triumphal Entry, and it is noteworthy that the high priests and scribes (ver. 15) make no reference to ver. 12 f. which relate the Cleansing of the Temple. Yet if vv. 10 f., 14–16 are older than the insertion of ver. 12 f. at this point, they are subsequent to the Marcan narrative, and their creation and attachment here will belong to an earlier stage in the history of the section. It may be further noted that ver. 10 f. and vv. 14–16 are not consecutive but read like alternative sequels to vv. 1–9. Accordingly we may reconstruct the history of the passage as follows. First Mark xi. 1–11 was read, next in the exposition of this passage the two expansions ver. 10 f. and vv. 14–16 were developed and became stereotyped and firmly attached to the homiletic tradition, and finally, between these two expansions, the evangelist inserted Mark xi. 15–19, which enabled him to bring together the two halves of the story of the Cursing of the Fig Tree. At Matt. xxi. 1–9 itself we may trace the same kind of development. At the earliest stage we have the Marcan story. Soon the quotation from Zechariah was added and in the next stage the quotation had reacted on the text. These two stages probably belong to the homiletic use of Mark, and the evangelist finally fixed the results in our Gospel.

The history of xxvii. 3–10 seems to be even more complicated. Here we must distinguish between two factors, the tradition about the death of Judas, and the quotation from Zechariah with its reactions on the tradition. The tradition we dealt with when we examined the peculiar narratives, but the reaction of the quotation on the tradition seems to have taken place in several stages. In one form of the text of Zechariah, preserved in the Peshitto and implied by the Targum, the prophet cast his wages into the treasury. This seems to have left traces in the phrases *ῥύψας τὰ ἀργύρια εἰς τὸν ναόν*, ver. 5, and *βαλεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν*, ver. 6. In the Massoretic text the prophet cast his wages to the potter and this form of the text has influenced ver. 7, *τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως*, and probably the quotation in ver. 9 f. Finally, the thirty pieces of silver of the quotation have influenced the form of xxvii. 3 and xxvi. 15. From this we may infer at least three stages in the development of the tradition. First the tradition was related in connexion with the Marcan story. Next it was influenced by the form of the Zechariah text as we have it in the Peshitto. Later still it was influenced by the form of the quotation which appears in ver. 9 f. It is easiest to imagine this complicated development taking place in the homiletic activity of the Church.

There are grounds for thinking that iv. 12–17 has a history. There seems to be a gap between ver. 12 and ver. 13. As distinct from his going into Galilee, we are told nothing about Jesus' visiting Nazareth; yet ver. 13 begins *καὶ καταλιπών τὴν Ναζαρά*. This is the more noteworthy as the same form *Ναζαρά* recurs only at Luke iv. 16, *καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά*. Such agreement naturally indicates the use of Q. An indication in the same direction is a slighter agreement in substance between the Matthean story of Jesus at Nazareth, derived from Mark, and the form of the story, peculiar to Luke, of iv. 16–30. Mark vi. 3 begins *οὐχ οὐδέτος ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων*,¹ referring to Jesus. Matt. xiii. 55 reads *οὐχ οὐδέτος ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος νιός*; while Luke iv. 22 ends *οὐχὶ νιός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὐδέτος*. This reference to Joseph, shared by Matthew and Luke, may come from Q, as it is absent from Mark. Further support for this view may be found in an agreement in order. Matt. iv. 12, Luke iv. 14 reproduce Mark i. 14, but both immediately afterward insert a reference to Nazareth, Matt. iv. 13, Luke iv. 16, and follow this by a reference to Capernaum. These three pieces of evidence may suggest that at one time between Matt. iv. 12 and 13 stood a version of Jesus' preaching at Nazareth derived perhaps from Q. Later this version was omitted in favour of the Marcan one. This points to an earlier grouping of material round Mark i. 14, which was subsequently remodelled. Such changes would easily take place in an homiletic context.

We have seen that xvi. 16–19 has passed through a complicated process of growth. Behind it there seems to be a Resurrection story which has been transferred to its present place and Matt. xviii. 18 has been adapted to it, while the reference to the renaming of Simon may have been added at this period. All this would require time. It is uncertain, also, if Matt. xiv. 28–31 could have lost its place in the Resurrection narratives and been adapted to its present setting, all at one stage. At Matt. xvii. 24–7, ver. 27 appears to be a later addition reflecting an issue which must have troubled the Church after A.D. 70 when the Temple tax was deflected to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome. Finally, the story has been attached to Mark ix. 33. The parable xxii. 1–14 has suffered two kinds of modification. The reference to the fall of Jerusalem has been introduced in ver. 7 and the story of the Guest without a Wedding Garment, vv. 11–13, has been tacked on, leaving its traces perhaps at ver. 2 also. Lastly, two formulae at ver. 13b and

¹ This seems to be the correct reading. For the variants see the apparatus in Legg, *Nouum Testamentum Graece, Euangelium secundum Marcum*, ad. loc.

ver. 14 have been attached. There is no trace of these changes in the parallel Luke xiv. 16-24, so that we may presume that they were absent from Q. Nor does it seem probable that they took place all at one time. Likewise it may be asked whether xix. 10-12 belongs wholly to one period. The verses do not seem to be a completely consistent whole. Verse 10 f. appear to refer to marriage while ver. 12 relates to celibacy. Further, ver. 10 f. would follow much better on Mark x. 12 than on Matt. xix. 9. In Mark Jesus has given an absolute rule: marriage is indissoluble and, until the death of one of the partners, any second marriage is adultery. Here the comment of Matt. xix. 10 f. would be most apposite. Verse 10 expresses the disciples' dismay at the inflexible rule and ver. 11 admits that it is a counsel of perfection. On the other hand, if we connect Matt. xix. 10 f. with the preceding verses in Matthew the disciples cavil at the relaxed rule of ver. 9 and even that is held not to apply to everyone. This would imply an almost Koranic laxity in sexual morality and an affirmative answer to the question in ver. 3. If the hypothesis that Matt. xix. 10 f. is really a comment on Mark x. 2-12 is sound, these two verses illustrate the outlook of the community when the rule of Mark x is modified in Matt. xix. The suggestion implies at least one stage between Mark and Matthew. The last sentence of ver. 12, similar as it is to δέ χωρν ὅτα ἀκονέτω, xiii. 9, cf. xi. 15, xiii. 43, seems like a tag added to the group of sayings. It picks up the χωροῦσιν of ver. 11, a fact that would agree with its lack of connexion with the earlier part of ver. 12. Thus we can detect three elements in the composition of the section, the attachment to Mark x. 1-12, the assembly of the material for the verses, and finally the addition of the formula to ver. 12.

About these passages the following features are to be noted. They require several stages in their composition. Frequently the material seems to rest in part on oral tradition. The passages have become associated with certain contexts. We have to ask in what circumstances these conditions could obtain. If we accept the suggestion that they were made possible by homiletic custom, this will account for the suggestions of oral tradition, of stages in composition, and of contextual association. As soon as written documents provided the sections for the liturgy, the stock material in homiletic would supply the only liturgical refuge for an oral tradition. A continuity in exposition would account also for the developments of the various stages in the material, while the contextual attachments would go back to the fact that in exposition

certain passages became associated and later this association became stereotyped.

The same kind of explanation will apply to the doublets in the Gospel. If we compare the numbers of doublets in the synoptic Gospels, we find 2 in Mark, 17 in Luke, and 27 in Matthew.¹ From this it is clear that they are much more characteristic of Matthew than of the other two Gospels and we may ask ourselves what the reason for this is. One explanation is that the doublets are the result of the use of a variety of sources. The argument from doublets to diversity of sources is frequent in Old Testament source analysis. It will also account for 11 out of the 17 doublets in Luke. Will it also explain the Matthean examples? In investigating this possibility we are again testing the adequacy of source criticism to explain the various phenomena of the Gospel. We may find that they appear rather to be due to the influence of the liturgical homily. To settle the matter we must examine the doublets in detail.

The first doublet is Matt. v. 29 f. with xviii. 8 f. beside Mark ix. 43, 45, 47. But we have to notice that Matt. v. 30 is omitted by D, 59, 238, 243, *d*, *v.g.* (1 ms.), *syr. sin.*, *sah.* (1 ms.), *boh.* (1 ms.), an omission which commends itself because, while ver. 29 with its mention of the eye is relevant to the context, the right hand has nothing to do with what precedes or follows. Matt. xviii. 8 f. is in the Marcan setting and contains the whole substance of the Marcan saying slightly compressed and varied in phrasing, while Matt. v. 29 has but one part of the saying, attached to a non-Marcan context and in wording even farther removed from Mark. There is no parallel in Luke. There are two possibilities. Either the saying at Matt. v. 29 has been transferred from its Marcan context or else Matt. xviii. 8 f. derives from Mark and v. 29 from M.²

Against this second view is, first, the fact that there is some verbal and considerable material agreement between Matt. v. 29 and Mark ix. 47. Secondly, v. 29 is extraneous to the structure of v. 27 f. This indicates that v. 29, in any case, is not in its original setting. This is not decisive against the second possibility, as v. 23 f., which apparently derives from M, is structurally foreign to v. 21 f. In the same way v. 29 may have had another context in M and have been transferred to its present one by the evangelist. This, however, seems to be the less probable and more complicated hypothesis. Accordingly the view that Mark ix. 47 is used twice

¹ Cf. Hawkins, *op. cit.*², 80–107. The enumeration above includes several that Hawkins rejects.

² Cf. p. 18 f. above.

over in Matthew seems far the more likely and, if this is so, the appearance at Matt. v. 29 may be due to homiletic associations.

Matt. v. 32 with xix. 9 beside Mark x. 11 and Luke xvi. 18 is more complicated. Here Matt. xix. 9, apart from the phrase *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, repeats Mark x. 11, while Matt. v. 32 seems to be a conflation of Q as represented in Luke xvi. 18. This holds good whether we omit in v. 32 *καὶ ὅς . . . μοιχᾶται* or no. Further, the whole setting of v. 31 f. appears to be due to the evangelist. In this example, the hypothesis that the presence of the doublet points to the use of two sources provides at least a partial explanation of the facts. It is equally probable that the position of v. 31 f. was chosen by the evangelist or that it may have been determined by homiletic practice.

At vii. 16-19 we have two different sets of doublets. vii. 19 repeats iii. 10, where it is in its Q position, parallel to Luke iii. 9. There is verbal identity which seems to exclude the possibility that we have a trace of the use of different sources. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the context of vii. 19, vv. 16-18, 20 are derived from another Q passage, and have a parallel in Luke vi. 43 f. But vii. 16-18, 20 have a doublet later at xii. 33-5. In Matt. vii, ver. 20 repeats ver. 16a and ver. 17 reads as a positive version of ver. 18, ver. 16 corresponds to Luke vi. 44 and ver. 18 to Luke vi. 43. In Matt. xii. 33-5 ver. 33b corresponds to vii. 16a and ver. 33a to vii. 17 while xii. 34, *γεννήματα ἐχθρῶν*, echoes iii. 7. In vv. 34b-5 are employed parts of Q, appearing at Luke vi. 45, which are not used at Matt. vii. 16-20. Thus our second set of doublets consists of vii. 16a, 17 with Matt. xii. 33. Apart from the variations in order, the Q passage as seen in Luke vi. 43-5 was, for the evangelist, linked with three contexts. First is the context of the Sermon, in which it occurs both in Luke and Matthew, where the theme is testing and discrimination. This appears to be the original place of the passage. Secondly, it occurs in the Beelzebub controversy, where the idea of judgement is present. Lastly, the use of phrases in both these passages connects them with another Q passage, Matt. iii. 7-10, where again we find the idea of judgement. As but one source is involved, we cannot find our explanation in documentary analysis. Rather we must look to an association of contexts for a solution of the problem and this association must have been made after Q came into use and before the composition of our Gospel. This would be easily comprehensible in the light of the liturgical use of the Church. It would be quite in keeping for this passage to be associated with the Beelzebub Controversy and

the Preaching of John, as well as with its proper context in Q, in the lectionary and exposition of a Church where Mark and Q were read. As soon as this obtained, it would be natural for the evangelist to repeat the verses in one of the two additional contexts and to insert reminiscences of the third among them. His variation of the order and structure would avoid monotony and the danger that the repetition would obtrude itself unpleasantly.

In Luke x, in the Commission of the Seventy, we find at vv. 12-15 the Woes on the Cities of Galilee for their ill reception of Jesus' works. At Matt. x. 15, the corresponding passage, only the introductory verse appears, answering to Luke x. 12, while in Matt. xi, to the section on John the Baptist, the editor adds the whole passage xi. 20-4. It is probable, from the fact that, in Matthew, x. 15 is retained in a place corresponding to that in Luke, that Luke has preserved the original setting of the verses. Why then do they appear in full in Matt. xi? As only one source can be presumed, an explanation from the documentary hypothesis is ruled out. In Matt. xi the judgements of their contemporaries on John and Jesus precede, and Jesus' thanksgiving that what is hidden from the wise is revealed to the simple follows, our section. The motivation of the whole passage seems to be the response of his fellows to Jesus and his judgement on that response. With this vv. 20-4 are eminently agreeable. This suggests that contextual associations have again been responsible for the appearance of doublets. The next doublets, x. 22a with xxiv. 9b and x. 22b, with xxiv. 13 may be taken together. There is also a slight similarity between x. 17, *παραδώσοντων γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια κτλ.*, and xxiv. 9, *τότε παραδώσονται ὑμᾶς εἰς θλύψιν*. The source is Mark xiii. 9-13. This passage, with the exception of most of ver. 10, the editor has transferred to Matt. x. 17-22. He has, however, retained the two halves of ver. 13 in their original connexion as Matt. xxiv. 9b and 13, inserting between them vv. 10-12, a later composition. At Matt. x. the verses from Mark xiii are well suited to their new context. Matt. x is concerned with the kind of reception the Christian evangelist must expect and the theme of Mark xiii. 9-13 is similar. Here again the explanation of the doublet seems to lie in the context and associations. As Mark xiii is the only source, source criticism does not provide an alternative hypothesis.

Matt. x. 38 and xvi. 24 have parallels at Mark viii. 34 and at Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27. Here the doublets, in both Matthew and Luke, appear to be due to the use of different sources. Matt. xvi. 24 and Luke ix. 23 reproduce Mark viii. 34 in the same context. Matt. x. 38

and Luke xiv. 27 are similar in structure and wording and seem to derive from Q. This would enable us to account for the doublet as arising out of the overlapping of Q and Mark.

Matt. x. 39 and xvi. 25 correspond to Mark viii. 35 and Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33. Overlapping of sources may again be the correct explanation. Matt. xvi. 25, Luke ix. 24 reproduce Mark viii. 35 in the same context. Matt. x. 39, Luke xvii. 33 seem to be independent of Mark, but do they come from Q? Both verses are briefer than the Marcan equivalent, agree in substance and structure, and are adjacent to Q material, Matt. x. 37 f. and Luke xvii. 34 f. On the other hand, there are no verbal agreements between Matt. x. 39 and Luke xvii. 33 against Mark viii. 35, and there is the possibility of Q and M, or Q and L, or even M and L, overlapping. On the whole, derivation from Q seems the more probable. However uncertain this may be, it appears likely that the presence of doublets in Matthew is to be explained as due to the use of two sources, Mark and either Q or M, which overlapped. This conclusion is unaffected by the variety of reading in Mark viii. 35. The next doublets, Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4, are to be compared with Mark viii. 12 and Luke xi. 29. Matt. xvi. 4 is in the same context as Mark viii. 12, and Matt. xii. 39 is in the same as Luke xi. 29, both Matt. xii. 38-42 and Luke xi. 29-32 apparently being taken from Q. In Matthew the doublets are almost identical, though at xvi. 4 we should probably omit *καὶ μοιχαλίς* with D, 4, a, d, e, ff¹, ff², g¹. There are agreements of both xii. 39 and xvi. 4 with Luke against Mark. This suggests that Q had been employed as well as Mark. Probably Luke xi. 29 reproduces Q more faithfully. In view of these facts the use of two sources again seems to have led to the presence of doublets.

Matt. xiii. 12 and xxv. 29 besides Mark iv. 25 and Luke viii. 18, xix. 26 present another example of this. Q, represented by Luke xix. 26, Matt. xxv. 29, overlapped Mark iv. 25, reproduced in Matt. xiii. 12 and Luke viii. 18, though Matthew does not retain the original context of Mark iv. 25 but places it earlier in that of Mark iv. 10 f. In the Marcan context the saying is one of several grouped together on account of incidental resemblances, while in Matthew it enhances the contrast between the disciples and the crowd. This transference may be due to the evangelist alone, but it may equally well derive from earlier homiletic use. The appearance of doublets, however, is to be explained from source criticism.

The doublets Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21, with Mark xi. 23 and Luke xvii. 6 are to be accounted for in the same way. Matt. xxi. 21

repeats Mark xi. 23 in the same setting. Matt. xvii. 20 has agreements both with Mark and with Luke, which is independent of Mark. This suggests that at Matt. xvii. 20, Mark and Q have been conflated. The context is different from that in Luke, the saying being attached in Matthew to the story of the Epileptic Boy, xvii. 14-19 from Mark ix. 14-29. The fact of duplication is explicable by the overlapping of sources, but this does not show us why in Matthew the Q saying is attached to a Marcan passage. Such an attachment would be understandable if it had already been made in exposition or lectionary, though this is not the only possibility.

A similar connexion exists between Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16 and Mark x. 31 and Luke xiii. 30. Mark x. 31 is reproduced in the same group of materials at Matt. xix. 30. Matt. xx. 16 agrees with Luke xiii. 30 in omitting *πολλοί*, Mark x. 31, and in reversing the order of clauses. This may suggest that the two verses derive from Q, though Matt. xx. 16 is probably conflate and occurs in a setting peculiar to Matthew, that of the Labourers in the Vineyard. Only this story separates it from xix. 30, the other occurrence of the saying. The duplication may accordingly have been caused by the intrusion of Matt. xx. 1-15 into the Marcan context. We may suggest some such development as this. In Mark the surrounding material provides no elucidation of x. 31. In Matthew the presence of *οὐτως* at xx. 16 shows that xx. 1-15 was intended in some sense to illustrate Mark x. 31, inexact though the illustration may seem to us. If this is so, we can understand how, following on xx. 1-15, xix. 30 is repeated at xx. 16 to ensure that the purpose of the addition should be clear. This process may be the work in part of the evangelist or may go back to homiletic needs, but it cannot be accounted for simply by the use of two sources.

Matt. xx. 26 f., xxiii. 11 with Mark x. 43 f., ix. 35 and Luke xxii. 26 may at first sight look more complicated. Matt. xx. 26 f., Mark x. 43 f. occur in the same context and are in close verbal agreement. Mark ix. 35 is not reproduced when the rest of this section is taken over into Matt. xviii. 1-5. Between Luke xxii. 26 and Matt. xxiii. 11, which appear in different settings, there is one agreement against Mark in the phrase *δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν* in Matthew and *δὲ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν* in Luke. This agreement in sayings which necessarily have a general similarity is enough to imply the use of Q. It is improbable that Luke xxii. 26 is in its original place in Q. Hence we cannot argue that at Matt. xxiii. 11 the evangelist has transferred the saying in a conflate form to a new place. Q, as represented by Luke xi. 39-52, combined with Mark xii. 38-40 and

M, seems to supply the material for Matt. xxiii, but that fact helps us little to decide the original place of Matt. xxiii. 11. Therefore we cannot say whether a theory of sources is enough to account for the presence of doublets or no.

The problem of Matt. xxiv. 42, xxv. 13 beside Mark xiii. 35 may in its solution prove more informative. Matt. xxiv. 42 does not recur in quite the same place as in Mark. Matt. xxiv. 36 reproduces Mark xiii. 32. Next comes a passage from Q, xxiv. 37-41. After this at Matt. xxiv. 42, ver. 35 alone of Mark xiii. 33-7 is represented, to be followed by another passage from Q, Matt. xxiv. 43-51, and xxv. 1-12, a peculiar section. To this succeeds xxv. 13, repeating Mark xiii. 35. The themes of the whole group of passages are fidelity, watchfulness, and prudence, and we seem to have a collection of material from various sources underlining and expanding the closing message of Mark xiii. Such a development might well have taken place in the homiletic exposition of the Marcan themes.

There is a different difficulty at Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, as, while most of the phrasing can be derived from Mark, *καὶ θεραπέων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν* is without parallel in Mark or Q. It may be that the phrase is of the evangelist's own composition. The sources of the two verses, however, diverse though they may be, do not enable us to see the reason for the repetition. The verses occur in similar positions. iv. 23 comes after a series of narratives and before the Sermon on the Mount. ix. 35 follows another group of narratives and precedes the discourse on Christian apostleship. As the assembly of these sequences of narrative and discourse appears to be the evangelist's work, we may presume that the doublets and their settings, related as they are to the larger sequences, come from him too. He, rather than sources or liturgical and homiletic practice, seems to be responsible for the phenomenon. This would agree with his authorship of the peculiar phrases.

Next to be treated are Matt. ix. 27-31, xx. 29-34 with Mark x. 46-52.¹ Matt. xx. 29-34 repeats Mark with some modifications but in the same position. This leaves Matt. ix. 27-31 to be accounted for. Apart from Matt. viii. 18-22 the call of Levi and the section on fasting, Matt. viiii-ix relates only healings and other miracles, and to achieve this concentration of material on one theme the Marcan order is disregarded. Matt. ix. 27-31 displaces Mark vi. 1-6, the Rejection at Nazareth, of which the Q account may have stood at one time after Matt. iv. 12. If the transference of Mark x. 46-52

¹ Streeter, op. cit., 170 f.

to its place at Matt. ix. 27–31 is connected with the displacement of the Rejection at Nazareth, it may have its grounds partly in liturgical practice. Otherwise this order and repetition will derive from the evangelist, who may have wished to make up a list of ten miracles.

For Matt. ix. 32 f., xii. 22–4 with Luke xi. 14 f. the source appears to be Q. Matt. xii. 22–4, Luke xi. 14 f. seem to be in their original place, introducing the Beelzebub Controversy, while Matt. ix. 32 f. is nearer Luke in wording. This excludes an explanation from the documentary hypothesis. Matt. ix. 32 f. is in the same group of miracles as is ix. 27–31 and we have the same alternatives to choose from. The setting may be devised by the evangelist or may go back to earlier exposition.

To Matt. xii. 38 f., xvi. 1 f. there are parallels at Mark viii. 11 f., Luke xi. 16, 29. Matt. xvi. 1 f. repeats Mark viii. 11 f. in the same context, and Luke xi. 16, though it is in the long non-Marcan section of Luke, is close to Mark in wording, and sits loose in its context, looking like a note inserted from the Marcan parallel. The explanation seems to be that the same kind of introduction has been provided in Matthew to both the Marcan and Q versions of the Enquiry for a Sign. This introduction may be the work of the evangelist or may derive from the lectionary setting.

Matt. iii. 2 recurs at iv. 17 with similarities at Mark i. 4, 14 f. Probably at iv. 17 we should omit *μετανοεῖτε* and *γάρ* with *k*, *syr.* *sin.*, *cur.*, Clem., Orig., Eus. (*syr. pal.*, *boh* (1 ms.) omit *γάρ* only).¹ This omission seems to be right, as in Matthew the tendency is not to assimilate Jesus and John but to emphasize differences between them. This omission reduces the resemblance between Matt. iii. 2 and iv. 17 considerably. Such similarity as survives may be assigned to the evangelist's hand.

The same quotation from Hos. vi. 6 appears at Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7. The setting of both verses is Marcan and contains a dispute with the Pharisees. In ix. 13 they complain that Jesus eats with publicans and sinners and at xii. 7 that the disciples have been infringing the Sabbath by plucking and eating corn. Further, there is a slight agreement with the Hebrew against the LXX (*καὶ οὐ* for *η*). As the evangelist himself regularly uses the LXX and not the Hebrew, this suggests that the quotation was already applied to the two passages before the evangelist produced the Gospel. We may then infer that the association of Hos. vi. 6 with the two controversy stories goes back to homiletic tradition.

¹ Blass, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Matthäus*, 9 f.

There are the doublets Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 18 with a parallel at John xx. 23. The saying probably comes from M, but we do not know its original context. We have seen that Matt. xvi. 17-19 is a composite enlargement of the Marcan section, while xviii. 18 is part of a long passage on discipline and forgiveness, built round the Q saying on the same theme, reproduced at Luke xvii. 3 f. This implies that neither context is original but that the saying appears in both because of previous association with both. Such association would naturally come into being in an homiletic grouping.

Matt. xi. 15 is repeated at xiii. 9, 43. Corresponding to it are Mark iv. 9, 23, Luke viii. 8, xiv. 35. Similar phrases appear at Rev. ii. 7, 11, 17, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22, xiii. 9. There is one agreement between Matthew and Luke, δέ χων instead of Mark's ὅς χει. This may indicate that the saying occurred in Q as well as Mark. Matt. xiii. 9 is in the same context as Mark iv. 9. Matt. xiii. 43 appears a little later in the sequence of material than Mark iv. 23. Matt. xi. 15 has no parallel. From these facts it is clear that the threefold occurrence of this saying cannot be explained from source criticism. It resembles the use of liturgical formulae treated earlier in this chapter. The reason for the repetition may likewise be found in the customs of liturgy and exposition.

Here the following resemblances within pairs of passages may be discussed. Matt. v. 34, xxiii. 22 have material in common. This seems to depend on the liturgical association of the same passage with two different settings. The explanation of the similarity between x. 17 and xxiv. 9 has already been discussed. There is a little in common between x. 40 and xviii. 5. xviii. 5 is close to Mark ix. 37 in phrasing and is in the same context. Matt. x. 40 ff. reads like an homiletic exposition of the same passage. The fact that Mark ix. 41 is reproduced at Matt. x. 42 shows that the Marcan passage was in mind when Matt. x. 40 ff. was composed. The likeness between xi. 27 and xxviii. 18 is slight and seems to be accidental. Matt. xxiv. 23 is derived from Mark xiii. 21 but Matt. xxiv. 26 from Q, the Lucan parallel being xvii. 23, and the resemblance is due to the overlapping of Mark and Q. xxviii. 10 owes much to xxviii. 7, which in turn is taken from Mark xvi. 7. This repetition has already been discussed once. It seems that the whole of xxviii. 9-20 was put into writing first by the evangelist. This may indicate that he was responsible for the echoing of ver. 7 in ver. 10. On the other hand, he may have merely recorded what was the usual supplement and expansion of Mark xvi. 1-8 in the oral traditions and sermons of the Church.

Having examined the doublets in Matthew we may now summarize our conclusions. Some of them can be explained partly or wholly as arising out of an overlapping of sources. This phenomenon seems to be behind the following doublets: v. 32 with xix. 9, x. 38 with xvi. 24, x. 39 with xvi. 25, xii. 39 with xvi. 4, xiii. 12 with xxv. 29, xvii. 20 with xxi. 21, xix. 30 with xx. 16, xx. 26 f. with xxiii. 11, xxiv. 23 with 26. While overlapping provides part of the reason for the appearance of these doublets, it does not always provide a complete explanation. It would be easy for an author like the evangelist, skilled in selection and conflation, to remove repetitions, unless there were good grounds for their retention. These grounds may be found either in the evangelist's purpose or in previous handling of the material such as we would expect to find in homiletic and liturgical custom. Other factors besides overlapping may well have some responsibility for the following doublets among others: v. 32 with xix. 9, xvii. 20 with xxi. 21, xix. 30 with xx. 16.

The activity of the evangelist may be detected in these passages: v. 32 with xix. 9, vii. 16–19 with iii. 10 and xii. 33–5, xiii. 12 with xxv. 29, xix. 30 with xx. 16, iv. 23 with ix. 35, ix. 32 f. with xii. 22–4, xii. 38 f. with xvi. 1 ff., iii. 2 with iv. 17, xxviii. 7 with 10. This indicates quite clearly that the sources alone are not sufficient to account for the doublets. We have to take into account other elements in the composition of the Gospel, for example, the activity of the evangelist himself.

Another factor seems to be found in the homiletic practice in the Church's liturgy. Good examples of this are vii. 16–19 with iii. 7, 10 and xii. 33–5, x. 15 with xi. 24, x. 22 with xxiv. 9b, 13, xvii. 20 with xxi. 21, xxiv. 42 with xxv. 13, ix. 13 with xii. 7, xvi. 19 with xviii. 18, xi. 15 with xiii. 9, 43, v. 34 with xxiii. 22, x. 40 with xviii. 5. It may perhaps be detected also at v. 29 with xviii. 8 f., v. 32 with xix. 9, xiii. 12 with xxv. 29, xix. 30 with xx. 16, ix. 27–31 with xx. 29–34, ix. 32 f. with xii. 22–4, xii. 38 f. with xvi. 1 ff., xxviii. 7 with 10. If we are to assess these probabilities and possibilities in relation to the doublets as a whole, we may perhaps say that the liturgical or homiletic factor must take at least half the responsibility. Our examination of the doublets has revealed not only that the documentary hypothesis is quite inadequate as an explanation of this feature of the Gospel, but also that two other factors have to be taken into account, the editor and the homiletic tradition, and that homiletic tradition is as important as the other two factors together.

In the investigation of the doublet ix. 13, xii. 7, at both of which

places Hos. vi. 6 is cited, another problem, that of the quotations, was approached. This must now be treated in detail. We have seen that the documentary hypothesis failed to explain them. We must now seek to discover if the liturgical factor, in particular the tradition of the sermon, makes things clearer. The examination in Chapter III of the quotations in the Gospel from the Old Testament showed that some of them at any rate were not first introduced by the evangelist nor derived by him from a written source. This means that they were traditional and that this tradition was oral. We have seen with the doublets how that context and association appear frequently to go back to the way in which the material was handled in sermons, a procedure which seems to have reached a certain fixity. We have now to inquire how far the same is to be found in the quotations. In this inquiry particular attention will be given to quotations which depart from the LXX.

Of these, the ones in Matt. i–ii teach us little. All we can say is that, while the two chapters were first put into writing by the evangelist, the quotations themselves must be older than he. In particular i. 21 from Ps. cxxx. 8, if the introductory formula of ver. 22 belongs to it, has a history. Being independent of the LXX, it was attached to the story at an early stage. Probably at the same period the formula of quotation was prefixed. Later this formula was transferred to introduce i. 23, which is according to the LXX, and this stage was stereotyped in the Gospel. If this supposition is correct then the formulae of introduction which accompany these quotations must also be older than the evangelist's handiwork. As the formulae are associated only with quotations independent of the LXX, this seems plausible.

Of the other quotations, iv. 14–16 occurs in a context which, as we have seen, shows other signs of successive changes. It seems to relate not to Jesus' settling at Capernaum so much as to the beginning of his ministry in general. Its association will accordingly be with Mark i. 14 f. as distinct from any visit to Nazareth and from the settling at Capernaum. This suggestion, combined with the hypothesis about the gap between iv. 12 and 13 implies the following history of the passage, subsequent to the appearance of Mark. With Mark i. 14 f. was associated the story of the Preaching at Nazareth as well as the quotation from Isaiah. The fact that Nazareth and Capernaum are mentioned before the quotation and not after it, which would be the natural order, suggests that the two additions to the Marcan narrative were made independently of each other. Later the Nazareth story was dropped, leaving its

only trace at iv. 13. At this point the evangelist stereotyped the material. Here we see a striking example of the working of the principle of association in the period between the appearance of the written sources and the composition of our Gospel.

At Matt. viii. 17 there is a simple attachment to a Marcan story. But Matt. xii. 17-21 is more complicated. Matt. xii. 15 f. is an abbreviated résumé of Mark iii. 7-12. To this Isa. xlvi. 1-4 is added. But while xii. 18-20 are independent of the LXX, ver. 21 follows it closely. This suggests that the quotation was inserted in two stages. First vv. 18-20 were cited and later ver. 21, taken from the LXX, was added. It is noteworthy that, when the quotation was thus expanded from the LXX, vv. 18-20 were not made to conform to this version. From this fact we may infer that the earlier part of the quotation had already attained a certain fixity in tradition. At Matt. xiii. 35 the quotation from Ps. lxxviii. 2 owes its first part to the LXX and the second is independent. It may be that the same kind of explanation as was given at xii. 17-21 is applicable here also.

While the story of the Entry into Jerusalem, Matt. xxi. 1-9, depends on Mark xi. 1-10, the quotation at vv. 4 f. from Zech. ix. 9 is not from the LXX. It has been suggested that at Mark xi. 2, πῶλον δεδεμένον ἐφ' ὅν οὐδεὶς οὕπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν echoes Zech. ix. 9 (LXX), πῶλον νέον. This may be so, but the Marcan clause is not repeated at Matt. xxi. 2. The quotation at Matt. xxi. 4 f., though there is no trace of it in Mark or Luke, appears at John xii. 14 f. This suggests that the association of the quotation with the story is older than its appearance in Matthew. It allows us also to trace two stages in the attachment of the quotation. In the first it is merely cited, as in John, but in the second it has reacted on the context as at Matt. xxi. 2, ὅνον δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς and ver. 7 ἥγαγον τὴν ὅνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἴματα καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν. Only when the quotation has reacted in this way is the passage finally fixed in the text of Matthew. The quotation from Zech. xi. 12 f. at xxvii. 9 f. has already been discussed. Here, too, several stages in the history of the quotation can be discovered. We may recall that the quotation of Hos. vi. 6 at Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7 is evidence for a like procedure.

The facts brought to light in our examination of these quotations can all be satisfactorily explained on the liturgical hypothesis. The fact that some at least of the quotations were given their present settings before the evangelist got to work, but subsequently to the use of written sources, points to some such theory. Some of

the Gospel's sections may have been regularly used with certain relevant Old Testament lessons, so that it would be natural and easy in the sermon to associate Old Testament verses with Gospel passages. Quite apart from these lectionary associations we should expect that in exposition stock quotations would be employed. It may be that quotations which derive from lectionary association keep closer to the LXX, while those which exhibit some freedom would come from the stock quotations of the sermon. If the preacher who first introduced these quotations into exposition had a knowledge of Hebrew or Aramaic, it would not be surprising if his quotation showed traces of the Hebrew text behind the Targums, themselves, it must be remembered, of liturgical origin. This suggestion must of course be regarded as merely tentative. We must also remember that even now little is known about the history of the LXX before the second century, and it may be that the quotations in Matthew which depart from our LXX owe some of their peculiarities to the use, at an earlier period in the community's worship, of other Greek translations. The important thing is that we should recognize the homiletic and liturgical background of the quotations as supplying an explanation of certain of their characteristics which could not be supplied on the documentary hypothesis alone nor, for that matter, on a theory of editorial activity.

Similar to the problem of the quotations is that presented by the peculiar narrative elements of the Gospel. Our earlier examination of these elements seemed to show that they could not be accounted for by being assigned to any documentary source. There were features in them some of which pointed to the hand of the editor and others to the use of oral tradition. Contexts provide some evidence, though, for the Birth and Resurrection stories, they can tell us little, since these had to stand where they do stand or not at all. With the quotations we have just dealt. This leaves for examination the Petrine and Passion stories and the miscellaneous narratives.

First, in the Petrine stories, we may notice the following traces of tradition. xvi. 16-19 in part and xiv. 28-31 may reproduce what were originally accounts of Resurrection appearances. If this is so, then we can point to an oral tradition behind the Matthean account. With this agrees our analysis of xvii. 24-7, according to which the story passed through at least one earlier stage before it was recorded by the evangelist. Next we may well ask why it is that Peter is regularly associated by the evangelist with themes of the

Church, authority, discipline, and the giving of rulings on disputed points. If this were a novelty of the evangelist's, we should somewhere expect to find an explanation, but if Peter had those associations in the traditions of the Church, no explanation would be needed.

In the Passion stories also traditional elements may be discovered. We found that xxvii. 3–10 probably went back to oral tradition and had a complicated history behind it. The same is true of the Resurrection stories, xxviii. 9 f., 16–20. Even more interesting, perhaps, than the traditional elements, is the motivation of some of the additions to the Marcan record. We have seen that xxvii. 3–10 is older than our Gospel and indeed at xxvi. 15 has reacted on the Marcan story. We may infer from this that the attachment of this tradition to the Marcan narrative belongs to an earlier stage and accordingly its motivation must be older also. The motivation of xxvii. 19, 24 f., 51–4, 62–6, xxviii. 2–4, 11–15, seems to be clear. The analogy of xxvii. 3–10 suggests that this motivation is older than the evangelist's work and it would be rash to suggest that he had invented the whole group of passages, providing their contexts and connexions. Indeed, at xxviii. 15 it is almost confessed that a piece of current apologetic is being reproduced. We may conclude that the evidence of context and motivation, even more than traces of oral tradition, reflects the earlier history of our material.

Apart from the fact that they display no elements of oral tradition, the same conclusion would appear to hold good for the miscellaneous narratives as well. The motivation of iii. 14 f., xvii. 6 f., xxi. 10 f., 14–16 is clear from the Marcan context, while we can trace several stages in the history of xxi. 10 f., 14–16, as we can of iv. 13–16.

While it seems probable that the evangelist was the first to put these stories into writing, there is reason for thinking that, because the elements of oral tradition, the contexts, and the motivation are older than the composition of the Gospel, much of the content will be older, too. We must look for a suitable vehicle to convey this material to the evangelist. As we can ignore the catechetical factor, there remains the liturgical one. This is supported by placing and motivation of the additions which would, on this hypothesis, derive from the expositional activity of the Church in its liturgy.

We may now examine some groupings of material in the book. Much of its order and arrangement is due to the written sources or the evangelist, but here and there the effects of the liturgical

practice of the Church may be traced. An example of this may, as we have seen, be found in some of the doublets. Another may be inferred at vi. 1-18. Here the material seems to be derived from Mark, Q, and M, so that we cannot hold the sources responsible for the grouping. Indeed it may be asked why vi. 14 f. is inserted from Mark xi. 25 at this point. Until it is recalled that almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, the themes of vi. 2-4, 5-7, 16-18, were, like the token penances of moral theology, the expressions of repentance and contrition, the presence of these two verses is inexplicable. This fact, however, shows that the presence of vi. 14 f., even more than that of vi. 9-13, goes back to homiletic association. The same may be true of xviii. 15-22. The introduction of Peter and the expansion of Q in vv. 15-17, 21 f., it is suggested, are older than the writing of the Gospel, and if this is so the same may be true of the grouping of the whole section.¹ Some examples must remain uncertain because of the difficulty of distinguishing groupings that were first assembled by the evangelist from earlier homiletic activity.

Another example of homiletic influence may be found among the parables. Mark iv. 3-9 is explained as allegory in iv. 13-20. We may presume something of the following development to explain this. First, its context having been lost, the parable was interpreted as an allegory. Next the allegorizing interpretation became stereotyped. Thirdly, this fixed form was put into writing as we have it in the Gospel. This development in three stages seems to require a long process of exposition. We have two further examples in Matt. xiii. xiii. 24-30 is explained at xiii. 36-43 and xiii. 47 f. at vv. 49 f. For these two peculiar parables the same inference will hold good. At one time the parables were read but obviously required interpretation. Next an allegorizing explanation was given in exposition, after this the explanation became fixed and traditional, and finally we have this explanation incorporated with the parable in written form. At xxv. 31-46 we have a block of material which is neither a parable nor the interpretation of one and yet is a consecutive discourse, though not an entirely consistent one, rather than a group of sayings more or less loosely connected. It seems to have been a sermon which has passed into the evangelical content. The peculiar element in Matt. xii. 38-42 may be accounted for as an expansion of Q to provide an homiletic explanation. This would also apply to such features as those in Matt. xxii. 2-10 which are not paralleled in Luke xiv. 16-24. Other

¹ Grouping may account for the present place of xii. 5-7, 11 f., xv. 12-14, 22-5, xix. 28.

expansions and additions to serve the ends of the sermon may be detected elsewhere.¹

In Chapter IV the division of Jewish sermon material into Halakah and Haggadah was briefly described. Parallels to both these types of exposition may be found in those elements in Matthew which seem to derive from the preaching in the worship of the community. Most of the peculiar narratives could at once be assigned to Haggadah. It would preserve such oral tradition as may be found in these passages and would claim as its own the midrashic additions to the Marcan story. Nor would Halakah be unrepresented. We noticed the connexion of Peter with the development of rulings. A good example of this may be found in Matt. xviii. 15-22 where from the Q saying on forgiveness is deduced practical counsel. The same interest would account for the difference between Mark vii. 21 f. and Matt. xv. 19. Another piece of Halakah occurs at x. 40-2 expanding Mark ix. 37. Matt. v. 34b-36, and, obscure as it is, xix. 10-12, are to be classified in the same way. Indeed, there are few passages where an homiletic background can be detected which cannot be put into one or other of these two divisions.

The frequent pieces of exhortation, especially at the end of a group of sayings, point to the method of the sermon. Matt. v. 16 is an hortatory addition to a Q saying. x. 16b, xviii. 35, xxv. 13 may be explained similarly, while x. 40-2, xi. 28-30, xxv. 31-46 owe their position to the same influence.

The evidence which we have surveyed is intended to demonstrate that much of the material in the Gospel shows signs of previous homiletic use, and it is claimed that, apart from the negative argument that these features cannot be ascribed to the evangelist or to written sources, positive indications are to be discovered. The indications of grouping, context, motivation, and of a previous history for some, at any rate, of the passages in question, the explanations, the parallels to Halakah and Haggadah, the exhortatory touches, all would on our theory require some such mode of construction and vehicle of tradition as is provided by the homiletic custom of the Church's liturgy. These indications require that the custom should be well established and have a long history and a fixed procedure, a condition that would be satisfied if the Church took over the sermon from the synagogue.

These influences from an homiletic and liturgical background teach us little, however, about the evangelist's purpose. To estab-

¹ Examples may be found at v. 22, xxi. 41b, 43, 45, xxiv. 14.

lish the liturgical nature of the purpose we must, especially in elements which may come from the evangelist, search for evidence that the Gospel was composed to serve in a more effective way the same needs of worship and sermon as its elements had served before its composition.

The first piece of evidence lies close at hand. The very fact that the evangelist retains so many characteristics of the sermon and the liturgy suggests that he was anxious to supply, from the treasure of the past, material for the homiletic and liturgical use of the Gospel in the future. Had he had, as we may assume St. Luke had, some intention alien to liturgy and sermon, their traces would have been fewer and harder to detect.

We may find a more detailed and concrete argument which points to the same conclusion. While the minutiae of grouping may often be taken from the sources or the tradition of the pulpit, the broader lines of order and arrangement may be assumed to be the evangelist's work. This would apply to the division of the Gospel into five books with the prologue and epilogue, the bisection of each book, and much of the structure of the discourses and narrative groups. In his grouping he seems to have aimed at associating material of like subject-matter without concerning himself to secure rigid consistency in the whole. This may, as has already been suggested, be due in part to a prudent conservatism but in part also to an attempt to make the book serviceable for exposition in the future. This would provide a reason for the rearrangement of Mark i. 29–vi. 11 and the building up of the Sermon on the Mount from a variety of materials often drawn from diverse contexts. A practical outcome of this is, that if any passage or section is to be found in our Gospel as well as in another, our Gospel is the one in which it may most easily be found.

The success of the Gospel in the ancient Church has been noted. If it proved useful in exposition, and the commentators of antiquity would suggest that it was, this success would be the more understandable if such were its purpose. Origen, Jerome, and Chrysostom give it full and careful exposition and Augustine uses it almost as much as the other three Gospels together.

That there was a need for one such volume as our Gospel may easily be seen. There would be a great inconvenience in attempting to use together in the Church's services such dissimilar documents as Mark, Q, and M, together with odds and ends of tradition and exposition. As soon as this mass of material became quite unwieldy, it was inevitable that an attempt should be made to build

the elements into one manageable whole. This again would point to an homiletic and liturgical purpose in the evangelist's activity.

These considerations suggest that the Gospel was compiled out of materials which had already been read and expounded in the services of the Church and that the evangelist composed it to serve this purpose more fully in the future. A comparison with Mark will show how successful this aim was. As has been seen, another proof of its success lies in its constant and preferential use by the Church. In this way we see that the internal indications of the Gospel, namely that it has the features of a liturgical book, are in agreement with the conditions implied by the external tradition.

VI

THE GOSPEL AND JUDAISM

Summary. The relations between Christianity and Judaism in A.D. 70-135 are studied as they illustrate Matthew, on the assumption that it was in these years that the breach between the two religions finally came and that the Gospel clearly reflects the conditions that led to the breach.

The fact that Matthew is the New Testament book closest to Rabbinical Judaism, though not to earlier Judaism, does not weaken its Christian character. In it the Law retained its influence, and, thus, much Jewish moral and religious teaching was transmitted to later Christianity. This transmission was hastened by the efforts of the Rabbis to force other Jewish sects to conform or to leave Judaism. Christianity chose the latter course and had to construct its own institutions and way of life. Controversy with the Jews was heightened and Christians were persecuted. The attitude towards Gentiles varies but is on the whole liberal. In Matthew the Pharisees are the dominant party in Judaism.

If our hypothesis about the liturgical background and purpose of the Gospel is correct, it provides the channel whereby the conditions and history of the community in which it originated could react on the text. It would be natural in sermons and reading to expound and understand much of the material in the light of the experience of the community. This interpretation would in turn have its effect on the text, an effect which literary criticism, combined with our knowledge of contemporary conditions, should enable us to trace.

Outstanding among these conditions is the Jewish character of the church in which the book was produced. In view of all the material that has been assembled to illustrate this, it is not necessary to give detailed proof of the statement.¹ It will, however, be profitable to explore certain features in this Jewish character further. Next we shall have to examine the attitude during our period of Judaism to Christianity and of the Church to the Jews, discovering, as far as we can, the basic issues involved. The debt of our community to Judaism in particular must be assessed.

Certain of the Jewish features of the Gospel have a bearing on its literary criticism. For example, among the objections advanced against the theory that Mark was used by Matthew is the fact that several passages in Matthew are more in accordance with Jewish conditions than their Marcan equivalents. From this it is argued

¹ Reference should be made to the work of Abrahams, Montefiore, Moore, Strack, Billerbeck.

that 'more Jewish' is the same as 'original', and that Matthew must therefore be primary and Mark secondary. Matthew in such passages will accordingly prove to be the source of the Marcan sections, a conclusion directly contrary to the implications of the bulk of research in the Synoptic Gospels.

As an example of this we may cite Mark x. 12 compared with Matt. v. 32, xix. 9. In Mark, the possibility of a woman divorcing her husband is taken into account, a possibility which existed in Roman but not in Jewish law. In the Matthean passages this provision is omitted, so that the saying conforms to Jewish practice.

Another passage where Matthew is more Jewish may be found at v. 13, ἀλισθήσεται, corresponding to Mark ix. 50, ἀρτύσετε, and Luke xiv. 34, ἀρτυθήσεται. Abrahams cited the Jewish saying, 'Salt if it has lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?'¹ and remarks: 'It would seem that the first Gospel has preserved the true reading.'

We may notice other differences between Mark and Matthew due to similar causes. Mark vii. 3 f., an explanation of Jewish custom, is absent from Matt. xv. 1 f. The addition of δεξίος in various passages seems also to be Jewish. It is present at Matt. v. 39 but lacking at Luke vi. 29. The right member of a pair is the more valuable and important.² Mark has βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, while Matthew with but three exceptions has βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, a definitely Jewish phrase. Matt. v. 18 mentions ἵωτα which is absent in the parallel Luke xvi. 17. To be apposite the ἵωτα must be the yod of the Hebrew alphabet.

These examples show that the difficulty posed is a real one. If we equate 'Jewish' with 'original' we are led to conclusions on certain passages which conflict with the main results of synoptic criticism. We can avoid these conclusions only by finding some other explanation of the more Jewish character, on occasion, of Matthew as compared with the other Gospels, especially with Mark. A solution may be found in a comparison of Mark x. 12 with Matt. xix. 9. In Mark the reference to divorce of her husband by the wife may be presumed to reflect the conditions of the Graeco-Roman world in which the Gospel was written rather than the customs of the Judaism in which the saying was uttered. But if, at an earlier date and in Gentile surroundings, Gentile customs could influence the presentation of the sayings of Jesus, there is no reason why, at a later date and in a strongly Jewish church,

¹ *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, ii. 183. On Matt. xxiv. 20 beside Mark xiii. 18 cf. *Judaism and Christianity*, I, *The Age of Transition*, 172.

² *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, x, under 'Right and Left'.

Jewish customs should not adjust the saying anew to Jewish ways. At Matt. xix. 9 this took the form of omitting Mark x. 12, a clause which, we may presume, had come into being to suit Roman Law, and this omission incidentally restored the saying to what was in this respect probably its original form. We may call this process one of rejudaization and this rejudaization is quite distinct from the retention of original Jewish features. To its account we must reckon those passages where Matthew is more Jewish than Mark. This explanation of the facts shows how difficulties which affect the conclusions of literary criticism cannot be resolved by this kind of criticism itself but force us to go outside it to the 'Sitz im Leben' of the Gospel. It also leaves the way open for the suggestion that the Jewish character of the 'Sitz im Leben' of the Gospel may be different from that of the Palestine in which Jesus worked and taught. This suggestion must be developed. Our chief source of information about Judaism is the Talmud and related literature. This literature is the product, over some five hundred years, of Rabbinical Judaism. Its beginnings may be found in the reconstruction of Judaism at Jamnia after A.D. 70 and its end somewhere about A.D. 600. Matthew owes its Jewish appearance to the fact that of all the New Testament writings it is most akin to the Talmud. But this very similarity is proof of a later date. Mark, in comparison, belongs to an earlier era, when Judaism was more varied and developed Rabbinism was unknown.¹

These conclusions introduce us to the problem of the Jewish character of the church for which Matthew was composed. As we have to picture this church in the last quarter of the first century, we have a certain advantage over those who deal with Judaism and Christianity before the fall of Jerusalem. Though Christian sources for the later period are rather less informative than those for the earlier, yet on the Jewish side we are much nearer to the date of the compilation of the Mishna, which preserves many more well-authenticated traditions from our period, and we have also the evidence that can be drawn from Matthew itself.

One conclusion already reached is important, namely that our community was Greek-speaking. One ground for this was found in the regular and exact use of the Septuagint. Another is that the written sources of the Gospel, which, we suggest, had themselves been used liturgically in the community, were in Greek. Mark is still extant and the indications which point to the document Q point to such a document as available only in Greek. Our

¹ Cf. pp. 106 f., below.

knowledge of M, such as it is, would suggest that it, too, was a Greek document. It does not read like a translation. It is noteworthy that the peculiar narratives, which according to our investigation were first put into writing by the evangelist, do not seem to have come from an immediate source which was Semitic in speech. Further, the Gospel itself was produced in Greek, with the intention that it should be used in the public worship of the church. The Aramaic expressions at Mark v. 41, vii. 11, 34, xiv. 36 as well as *βοαηργύες* at iii. 17 disappear in Matthew. Acts i. 19 retains the Aramaic name of Judas's field but at Matt. xxvii. 8 only the Greek is given, *ἀγρὸς αἰμαρος*. All this evidence taken together implies that the community was Greek-speaking rather than bilingual.

None the less, certain traces are to be discovered in Matthew of a Semitic background. One, the reference to *לֹהֶת* in Matt. v. 18, which indicates an acquaintance with the Hebrew alphabet, has already been noticed. A few of the quotations also seem to require a knowledge of the Hebrew to account for their divergences from the Septuagint. In particular, various phrases in Matt. xxvii. 3-10 apparently rest on different readings in the Hebrew original at Zech. xi. 12 f. The original text, 'into the treasury', is recalled by ver. 5, *εἰς τὸν ναόν*, and ver. 6, *εἰς τὸν κορβανᾶν*, while the variant, 'unto the potter', is to be traced at ver. 7, *τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως*, and in the actual quotation itself at ver. 10.

The quotation at Matt. xxvii. 46 becomes of particular interest at this point. The manuscripts vary considerably both here and at Mark xv. 34. The subsequent reference to *Ηλίας* in the two Gospels favours the view that *ηλί* is the original reading.¹

In Mark it has the following support: *ηλει* D, Θ, 059, 0192, 565; *ηλι* 131 Epiph.; *heli* c, ff, (i), k, n, vg, (2 mss.); *il* syr. *pesh.*; *eli arm.* In Matthew *ηλι* or *ηλει* is much better supported. But though this form is Hebrew we are reminded that it occurs in the Targums.² *ελωει*, the variant in Mark and Matthew, is more probably Hebrew than Aramaic,³ though this is not certain.⁴ *λαμα* is Hebrew, *λεμα* is Aramaic. Both at Mark xv. 34 and at Matt. xxvii. 46 these forms occur as variants. *σαβαχθανι* is Aramaic but the variant, *ζαφθανι*, seems to be Hebrew. For this reading the evidence in Mark is *ζαφθαει* D, *zapthani d*, *zaphani k*, *sapthani ff²*, *izpthani i**, *sabtani vg*. (1 ms.), *zaptani vg*. (2 mss.), *zabathani gat.*,

¹ *J.T.S.* xix. 12.

² McNeile, ad loc.

³ Dalman, *Aramäische Grammatik*², 156, n. 1.

⁴ Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*², 131 f.; Wordsworth and White, *Nouum Testamentum Latine, i, Evangelia*, 166.

zabatani *vg.* (1 ms.) while B, οἱ ιἱ have the conflate reading ~~ζαφθανί~~^{ζαφθανεῖ}; with the reading *ζαφθανί* may be connected the variant ~~δισας~~^{δισεῖ} D, *c*, *i*, *k*, with some support from Macarius Magnes. In Matthew the evidence is *ζαφθανί* D, zapthani *d*, *ff²*, *h*, zabtani *b*, zahtani *a*, zeptani *vg.* (1 ms. corr.), zaptani *vg.* (4 mss.), zabthani *vg.* (1 ms.), zabatani *vg.* (1 ms.). From these facts we can see that each word may in both Gospels be read in an Aramaic or in a Hebrew form, and that evidence is lacking to decide in which language the quotation was made in each passage. We may however recall that at Matt. i. 21 *Ἴησοῦν*, 23 *Ἐμμανουὴλ*, a knowledge is shown of Hebrew, while, except for *Γολγοθᾶ* xxvii. 33, the evangelist takes over none of the Aramaic phrases of Mark. This lack of sympathy with Aramaic and the contact with Hebrew suggest that at Matt. xxvii. 46, too, the quotation was in Hebrew. It must nevertheless be recognized that such a conclusion is probable rather than certain.

The conclusion that the Semitic background of Matthew is probably Hebrew rather than Aramaic is important. If it had been Aramaic, this would have implied that the church was in a region where Greek and Aramaic overlapped, a view contrary to our inference that it was Greek-speaking, and not bilingual, or else that its Christianity had not long left an Aramaic source, which would disagree with the considerable traces of the liturgical use of Mark and Q. The slight knowledge of Hebrew shown could be traditional and, as distinct from a knowledge of Aramaic, would be a little academic. This modification of the thesis that Greek was the language of our Gospel and of the church in which it was written does not affect it seriously.

To understand the significance of this thesis we must recall the linguistic and cultural conditions of our period. It is natural to make a division in the Judaism of this time, one side being Greek in speech and Alexandrine in culture, the other Aramaic in speech and Rabbinic in culture. Philo would be typical of the one and the Talmud of the other. In Matthew, however, we have a document whose language is Greek but whose thought is of the same kind as that of the Talmud. A comparison with the Gospel according to St. John is of interest. In John the language indeed is Greek but the Aramaic ways of expression so often shine through that it has been argued more than once that the Gospel is a translation from the Aramaic. On the other hand, most attempts to illustrate its thought have turned for their material to Philo and the Hermetica, if not to Gnostic sources. In this way the two Gospels warn us

against identifying the linguistic frontier between the Greek and Semitic worlds with the cultural frontier between Hellenism and Judaism. Soon after the time of our two books, the triumph of Pharisaism produced, as one of its consequences, such an identification, and the boundary in thought and culture became in time one with the linguistic boundary. As a result of this, men and books which stood between the two frontiers were no longer possible, and much evidence for such an intervening area at an earlier time has been lost, a consequence which has made the understanding of Matthew the harder.

In the preceding paragraph it has been assumed that Matthew is closely connected with the Rabbinic Judaism of the end of the first century. This assumption requires to be supported. If we compare Matthew and Mark we find a difference which may be stated thus: Mark reflects Jewish Palestine before the War of A.D. 66–70, while Matthew is more akin to the Rabbinism which worked out its programme at Jamnia and subsequently became dominant in Judaism. In Mark, Jesus is in contact with Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, and, most of all, with the common people, the '*am ha-'arez*'. In Matthew, the Herods and the Herodians almost disappear from the story and only archaism keeps them there at all, and the same is true of the Sadducees of history. The Pharisees and the controversies with them, on the contrary, come into the forefront, and beside them even the common people take a second place. The points of controversy, too, are made more precise and take us further into the Rabbinic tradition. At Mark x. 2 Jesus is asked *εἰ ἔχεστιν ἀδόπι γυναικαὶ ἀπολῦσαι*, but at Matt. xix. 3 there is added *καὶ πᾶσαν αἵτιαν*, an addition which adapts the question to the form in which it was debated in Scribal circles. At Matt. xii. the addition of *ἐπείνασαν* in ver. 1 and of ver. 5 makes the issue more detailed, and illustrates it with an exception recognized in Rabbinic law. This is also true of ver. 11 whether we consider the addition apt or no. Much of the peculiar material is likewise more noticeably Jewish than much of Mark and Q. A good example of this is Matt. vi. 1–18. Matt. xxiii. 1–36, composite as it is, derives about half its material from peculiar sources or editorial re-handling and this peculiar element is on the whole more technical than the rest.¹ Matt. xxii. 11–13 has an exact Jewish parallel and xx. 1–16 reads like an expansion of a Jewish saying. Matt. xiii. 52 betrays the outlook of the Gospel, and von Dobschütz, in his article 'Matthäus als Rabbiner und Katechet' gives a fuller treatment of

¹ Bacon, op. cit. 71–3, 131–3.

this characteristic of the Gospel.¹ Both von Dobschütz and Bacon remark on the parallels with the teaching of Johanan ben Zacchai, a leading figure in the Judaism of Jamnia after A.D. 70.

Though such is the nature of the Jewish character of our Gospel and, by inference, of the community in which it was produced, it does not prevent the book from being thoroughly Christian. This feature at once reveals the difference between Judaism and our community, namely in its doctrine of Christ. This may be illustrated from all parts of the Gospel. The quotation at ii. 15, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν νίνον μου, agrees with iii. 17 from Mark i. 11. xxii. 41–6 from Mark xii. 35–7 repeats the idea of sonship which is present at xi. 27 from Q. The title, ‘Son of Man’, occurs 30 times in Matthew, 14 in Mark, 25 in Luke, and 13 in John, and, whatever the origin and meaning of the term in the tradition, it denotes for the evangelist a supernatural figure. He is to come as Son of Man, x. 23, in the glory of his Father, xvi. 27, in his own glory, xxv. 31, with his angels, xiii. 41, xxiv. 31, and will sit upon the throne of his glory, xix. 28, xxv. 31, where he will judge the nations, rendering to every man according to his deeds, xvi. 27. We find also the other Messianic titles. He is ὁ ἐρχόμενος and ὁ Χριστός and David’s son. His supernatural character is shown by his birth, the voices at certain points in his career, his works of healing, the portents that surround his death and his resurrection. He brings forgiveness of sins. Not merely is there Matt. ix. 2, derived from Mark ii. 5, but we have xxvi. 28 and at i. 21 the quotation of Ps. cxxx. 8. At Mark i. 4 John’s Baptism is described as being εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν, but at Matt. iii. 1–6 the phrase disappears and John becomes merely a preacher of repentance, of the Kingdom, and of one mightier than he. As we can see from Matt. iii. 14 f. as well, the evangelist carefully distinguishes between Jesus and John. John is Ὁλίας the forerunner, xi. 14, xvii. 13, and at iii. 4 the evangelist adds καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὁσφὺν αὐτοῦ (at Mark i. 6 we must omit these words with D, old Lat.), a quotation from 2 Kings i. 8, the description of Elijah. Jesus is himself foretold in the Scriptures. Finally we must notice the surprising Trinitarian formula of xxviii. 19.² These references should suffice to show that the book reflects no weak or non-committal Christology.

Agreeable with this, but of peculiar relevance to a Jewish community, is the contrast between Jesus and the Law. Bacon has convincingly developed the view that the Gospel is the new Law

¹ Z.N.W. 1928, 338–48.

² On the text cf. McNeile ad loc., *Didache*, vii. 3, Justin, *Apol.* i. 63.

and that the fivefold division of chapters iii–xxv is a deliberate imitation of the Pentateuch. The mountain of the Sermon on the Mount is meant to recall Sinai, and Jesus is himself a greater law-giver than Moses. Hence Jesus is the fulfilment of the Law and revises both it and the oral tradition. The central position that Judaism gave to the Law, the Gospel gives to Jesus. So xi. 28–30, xviii. 20, which in Judaism would be said of the Law, in Matthew refer to Christ.

This does not mean, however, that Matthew is hostile to the Law in itself. Provided that its dependence on Jesus was recognized, a place might be found not merely for the Torah but even for Scribal tradition, xxiii. 3. Even xv. 1–20, derived from Mark vii. 1–23, becomes, through the addition of vv. 12–14, an attack on the Pharisees rather than on the unwritten tradition. Indeed, we have suggested that in the Gospel itself the process of creating new Halakoth out of the sayings of Jesus, as at xviii. 15–22, goes on, just as the Rabbis sought to derive their Halakoth from the Law.

It was this attitude to the Law which enabled so much of the moral teaching and institutional life of Judaism to pass over into Christianity. It is true that we can detect little of the institutions of the Church from our Gospel, but we have in it a great wealth of moral teaching. This silence about institutions need not, however, cause us to infer that they did not exist. It is a fair conclusion that, if an institution existed in Judaism before A.D. 70 and is found later in Christianity, for example in the *Didache*, Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, or in the Church's constitutional literature, it has been derived from Judaism at an early date unless some other source is clearly indicated. Since, between A.D. 70 and 135, Christianity rapidly developed from a Jewish sect into a religion independent of and often hostile to Judaism, we may put most of the Church's debt to Judaism before A.D. 100. Further, in communities such as the church of our Gospel, which were strongly Jewish in character and yet early opposed to Rabbinic Judaism, this debt would be very great and would occur at the earliest period. On these grounds we may suppose that the ethics and institutions of this church would be thoroughly Jewish, but that its Judaism was subordinate to its Christology.

This treatment of the Law differs somewhat from that of St. Paul. In his epistles some passages commend the Law as having a place in the divine dispensation, but controversy forced him more often to emphasize its temporary and defective character. In this way the Law and its works fail to provide the justification that

Christ gives through grace and faith. The evangelist, as we saw, would be at one with St. Paul in asserting the superiority of Christ to the Law, but would disagree with him in maintaining that this superiority does not exclude the Law from an important, though subordinate, place in the Christian scheme. He effects his reconciliation of the two by making Christ the giver of a revised Law. This settlement of the dispute provided a basis for the building up of a new, Christian moral theology out of the tradition of Jewish teaching.

If its treatment of the Law rather than its Christology distinguished our community from St. Paul, its Christology much more than any other features separated it from Judaism. On its relations with non-Christian Judaism we have considerable indirect evidence, derived partly from Jewish sources¹ such as the Talmud and Midrashim, partly from Christian writings such as the later books of the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers. Mainly evidence that can be traced back to the period A.D. 70-135 will be used, a limitation which excludes certain statements sometimes quoted from Jewish sources. First we will concern ourselves with the attitude of non-Christian Judaism to Christianity and next with the attitude of our community and of the Christian Church in general to Rabbinic Judaism.

The most informative piece of evidence for the policy of the Pharisaic schools towards Jewish Christians is the Birkath ha-Minim. In its earliest known form it may be translated as follows: 'for the excommunicate let there be no hope and the arrogant government do thou swiftly uproot in our days; and may the Christians and the heretics suddenly be laid low and not be inscribed with the righteous. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant.'² This benediction was composed by Samuel the Small at Jamnia in the time of Gamaliel II, c. A.D. 85. That in its earliest form it contained an explicit mention of the Christians seems clear from Epiphanius, Haer. xxix. 9 and Jerome on Isaiah v. 18, xlix. 7, lii. 4, as well as from the Cairo Genizah fragments and other Jewish sources.³ The immediate result of this insertion in the liturgy would be to make it impossible for Jewish Christians to take part in the worship of the synagogue. The passages John ix. 22, xii. 42, and especially xvi. 2 may be connected with such a

¹ For these I have used Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen*.

² Strack, op. cit. 66* f., 31; Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst*³, 36-9, 51 f., 516 f., n. 10.

³ Cf. Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.* xvi. 4, καταρώμενοι ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν τὸν πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστόν.

result. Written at the end of the century, they would show how the Christians understood the benediction to operate against them.

Traces may be found in our Gospel, too. At Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, x. 17, xii. 9, xiii. 54 *συναγωγή* is followed by *αὐτῶν* and at xxiii. 34 by *ὑμῶν*. Only at vi. 2, 5, xxiii. 6, is it not followed by a genitive. At Mark i. 21, 29, iii. 1, vi. 2, xii. 39, xiii. 9, the word occurs without a pronominal genitive following. At Mark i. 23, 39 *αὐτῶν* follows *συναγωγή*, but at i. 23 it is omitted by D, L, 72, 579, b, c, e, ff, g', l, t, vg. (1 ms.) and according to Merk by 4,245 *cop.* At i. 39 it is omitted by b, c, e, q, *syr. sin.*, *geo.* Of the fifteen occurrences of *συναγωγή* in Luke only at iv. 15 is it followed by a pronominal genitive, *αὐτῶν*, which is omitted however by D, a, b, l. In John *συναγωγή* occurs at vi. 59, xviii. 20, at both places without a dependent genitive. From this we may infer that, while in Matthew *συναγωγή* is regularly accompanied by the genitive plural of a personal pronoun, in the other Gospels it is not, and that in three places in Mark and Luke, where most texts add *αὐτῶν* this word is to be omitted, with the authorities mentioned above, as an assimilation to the Matthean idiom. But this idiom raises a question; why was this change in phrasing made? The fact that it is so regular makes it difficult to argue that it is accidental.

This conclusion is supported if we examine the contexts of the phrase for the antecedent of the pronoun. At iv. 23, if we are to understand *αὐτῶν* from the context, we have to infer *τῶν Γαλιλαίων* from *τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, which is awkward. At ix. 35 we may interpret *αὐτῶν* from *τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κύρας*. As ix. 34 is interpolated, we cannot refer *αὐτῶν* to *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* in that verse. At x. 17 *αὐτῶν* can be connected only with *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. At xii. 9 *αὐτῶν* cannot really refer to anything in the context. The nearest relevant noun is *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* at xii. 2, but then the verse reads very oddly: *καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἥλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν*. At xiii. 54 *αὐτῶν* may find its antecedent in *τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ*. At xxiii. 34 *ὑμῶν* is to be explained from *γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι*, ver. 29 and earlier verses. This examination of the passages shows that, apart from xxiii. 34, the attempts to explain the genitive pronoun from the context are forced and far-fetched. Nor do they really explain why the evangelist felt it necessary regularly to add the pronoun with this forced contextual connexion. We may accordingly give up this attempt to account for the addition and look for an alternative.

The fact that the pronoun is added in all but three cases suggests that it has not a varying contextual significance, but a uniform

one. This may be found in the consequences of the Birkath ha-Minim. By it the Christians were driven from the synagogues of the Pharisaic party. On this view we can perceive why a pronominal genitive is absent from vi. 2, 5, xxiii. 6. The faithful are bidden to refrain from ostentatious piety in synagogues in general and not merely in 'their' synagogues where the twelfth benediction obtained. This use of αὐτῶν may perhaps be detected at Matt. vii. 29, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς ἀντῶν, the original of which, Mark i. 22, has simply καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς. That there were Christian γραμματεῖς we know from Matt. xiii. 52, πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητεύεις τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, and xxiii. 34, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας καὶ σόφους καὶ γραμματεῖς. We may then detect in the phrase 'their synagogues' a result of the Birkath ha-Minim, the exclusion of Christian Jews from Rabbinical synagogues.

Another measure taken against Christianity is recorded in Justin, but it belongs to an earlier period. It runs: ἀνδρας ἐκλεκτοὺς ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐκλεξάμενοι τότε ἔξεπέμψατε εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν λέγοντες αἵρεσιν ἀθεον Χριστιανῶν πεφηνέναι καταλέγοντές τε ταῦτα ἄπερ καθ' ἡμῶν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες ἡμᾶς πάντες λέγουσιν.¹ There is no evidence for this in the Jewish texts. A similar passage (*Dial. cum Tryph.* cviii. 1) shows contact with Matt. xxvii. 63. τότε is after the Resurrection. Acts xxviii. 21 implies that the measure had not been taken by that time. This suggests that it belongs either to A.D. 60–5 or after A.D. 70. In view of the fact that the Birkath ha-Minim belongs to c. A.D. 85, probability seems to favour the later date. The fact that James commanded wide respect in Jerusalem outside the Christian Church, and that his death in A.D. 62 was regretted by many non-Christian Jews, suggests that before the Jewish War Judaism was not united in active opposition to Christianity, and supports our conclusion about the date of the measure referred to in Justin.

Two stories have come down to us in several lines of tradition, illustrating the Jewish avoidance of contact with Christian Jews. They belong to the period A.D. 100–30 and are found only in Jewish sources. The first is the story of Eleazar ben Dama and Jacob of Kephar Sekhanya. Eleazar was bitten by a snake. Jacob, who came to heal him in the name of Jesus ben Pandera, was prevented by Ishmael. Ben Dama died before he could persuade Ishmael to withdraw his opposition.² The second story belongs to the same period and Jacob comes into it also. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos was on

¹ *Dial. cum Tryph.* xvii. 1. Similar passages are cviii. 2, cxvii. 3.

² Strack, op. cit. 21* f.

trial for heresy and was acquitted. Afterwards, Aqiba suggested in a conversation that Eliezer might at some time have approved a saying made to him by one of the Minim. Thereupon Eliezer recalled that he had unwarily let himself applaud a specious halakah of Jesus recounted to him by Jacob in a conversation.¹ These stories show that by the beginning of the second century all religious contact with Christian Jews had been condemned. There are later passages which extend the prohibition to all intercourse with Minim but these may be theoretical developments in academic circles. Earlier, however, is Tosephta Baba Mesi'a, ii. 33,² which appears contemporary with the Mishna while its material seems to be early. Gentiles and those who keep small cattle are neither drawn out of nor pushed into (a pit). Minim are pushed in and not drawn out. If this describes the attitude of the Rabbis at the time of our two stories, then not religious only, but all intercourse must have been difficult. This is supported by the passage in Justin (*Dial. cum Tryph.* xxxviii. 1): *καὶ ὁ Τρύφων εἰπεν· Ὡς ἀνθρωπε, καλὸν ἦν πεισθέντας ἡμᾶς τοῖς διδασκάλοις νομοθετήσασι μηδένι ἐξ ὑμῶν διμλεῖν μηδέ σοι τούτων κοινωνῆσαι τῶν λόγων.* Not only was religious intercourse with Christians forbidden but Christian literature was condemned.³ Tosephta Yadaim ii. 13 says that the books of the Minim defile not the hands. A similar ruling appears at Tosephta Sabbath xiii. 5. The Rabbis who figure in the following discussion, Jose the Galilean, Tarphon, Ishmael, indicate that the discussion itself may date about A.D. 90–120. The ruling may be a little earlier. It runs, ‘The book margins and the books of the Minim are not saved but they with the divine names in them are burned where they are.’ Christian books are not merely not to be treated as canonical but are to be destroyed outright. Both the reference to Gilyonim and Bab. Sabbath 116a, b suggest that already Christian books were known as Gospels.⁴

Beside these measures taken by the Rabbis against the Jewish Christians, something of the lines of controversy between the two bodies can be learned from Jewish sources. One group of passages maintains the unity of God against the Minim, the second contains controversial matter on Jesus, and the third, which is later in date, explicitly denies that God had a son.

It is not easy, at first sight, to make out against whom the first set of texts is directed.⁵ As soon, however, as it is remembered

¹ Strack, op. cit., 23⁴–6⁴.

² Ibid. 56⁴ f.; compare all § 19.

³ Ibid. 61⁴ f.

⁴ Ibid. 19⁴ f.; cf. *Judaism and Christianity*, ii. 131–3, and *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vi, under ‘Evangelium’.

⁵ Strack, op. cit., p. 70⁴–4⁴.

that Minim are Jewish heretics and not heathen, the field of choice seems to be limited to Jewish Christians and the so-called Epicureans. The earliest names mentioned, Aqiba, Jose the Galilean, Eleazar ben Azariah, bring the discussion into the first quarter of the second century (*Bab. Sanhedrin* 38b). The attack on the view that there were two powers would apply to the Christian doctrine of Jesus. Gen. i. 26 was certainly quoted by Christians in support of their theology, and the plurals in the Old Testament which refer to God were frequently used in support of the Trinitarian dogma.

The passages which relate to Jesus are explicit.¹ His birth was shameful. (*Kalla* 4rd; to this *Mishna Yebamoth* iv. 3 may refer.) He was a magician who learned his magic in Egypt (*Tosephta Sabbath* xi. 15, *Pal. Sabbath* xii. 4, *Bab. Sabbath* 104b). The references to his execution are late and erroneous (*Tosephta Sanhedrin* x. 11, *Pal. Sanhedrin* vii. 16, *Bab. Sanhedrin* 67a). The statements of *Bab. Sanhedrin* 107b (cf. *Sota* 47a) seem to be unhistorical. Already, according to Justin (*Dial. cum Tryph.* xvii, lxix, cviii, cxvii) Jewish propaganda was attacking Jesus. Celsus seems to have drawn considerably on Jewish polemics.² He wrote c. A.D. 120–80 and his Jewish material must belong to the first half of the second century, a conclusion supported by the evidence of Justin. This would agree with the dating of the attack on the view that there were two powers, to the first quarter of the second century. Later we shall see that Matthew already has to refute Jewish propaganda. The passages which deny that God had a son are much later.

This survey indicates that the Rabbinic leaders in our period were taking active measures against Jewish Christianity. These consisted in exclusion from the synagogue, from religious, and perhaps all, intercourse, in prohibition of Christian literature, and in propaganda against Jesus and the Church's claims on his behalf. In practice this meant that the Jewish Christian had to cease from being a Christian or from being a Jew. How far this was the purpose of the Rabbinical measures must now be investigated.

After the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70, Pharisaism was the one surviving organized Jewish sect. The Sadducees, who had been their serious rivals before the fall of Jerusalem, ceased after that event to be important in Judaism, while the Essenes and other smaller sects were never serious competitors for its control. Christianity,

¹ Strack collects them in §§ 1–8.

² M. Lods, *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, 1941, pp. 1–33. I have seen only an abstract of this.

however, asserted that it was the true Israel, and it was bound to dispute the future of Judaism with any other claimant. Pharisaism was forced to take up the challenge, in view of its own policy. It had composed the dispute between Hillelites and Shammaites, had excommunicated dissenters, and had thus obtained internal unity. At Jamnia it had also outlined a programme for Judaism as a whole, the triumph of which rendered later Judaism narrower and more nearly uniform, and it was already applying this programme.¹ In support of it the measures taken against Jewish Christianity were, from the Pharisaic point of view, inevitable in defence of the faith. From the Christian point of view they were something quite different.

Not only does the evidence of Christian writings of this period agree in the main with that of Jewish sources on the measures taken by the Rabbinic leaders against Jewish Christians, but here and there it adds fresh details. Antagonism was most marked where Christians were of Jewish origin. Hence we find the strongest enmity in the Revelation, in the Gospel according to St. John, and in our Gospel.

In the Revelation, John has in mind Christians who have suffered persecution and may suffer it again.² There is also hostility to the Jews, ii. 9, iii. 9. Is there any connexion between these two facts? Both ii. 9 and iii. 9 are in contexts which allude to persecution. It has also been suggested that the Scarlet Woman of chapter xvii is Jerusalem rather than Rome.³ If this is so, xvii. 6, *μεθύονσαν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ἀγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ*, becomes relevant. Jerusalem has given herself to persecution. We know that at a later period, in A.D. 156, the Jews played an active part in the martyrdom of Polycarp at Smyrna (*Mart. Pol.* xii. 2, xiii. 1, xvii. 2, xviii. 1). It is uncertain whether Herodes, the police agent, is a Jew or not. The scene of Justin's dialogues with Trypho is Ephesus, but this does not imply any Jewish activity in persecution there. Ignatius condemns the Jewish teaching current in Asia, but does not suggest that the Jews there were persecutors. We may conclude that there was hostility between Jew and Christian in Asia in the latter part of the first century, and there is a possibility that the Jews were also engaged in persecution.

This possibility is supported by the evidence of the Fourth Gospel. The Book is characterized by strong enmity to the Jews.

¹ Cf. *J.T.S.* xxvi. 347-64.

² Rev. i. 9, ii. 10, 13, iii. 10, xii. 17, xiii. 7, xvii. 6, xviii. 24, xix. 2, xx. 4.

³ V. Burch, *Anthropology and the Apocalypse*, 123 f.

If its evidence may be taken as having a contemporary reference, controversy was fierce over Jesus' claim to be the Son of God, v. 17 f., xix. 7, over the Law, vi. 32-5, vii. 19, 37-9, and over the Sabbath, v. 10-12, 16-18, vii. 22-4, ix. 14-39. At vii. 22-4 circumcision is not a matter of controversy and this agrees with the silence of Rabbinical sources and of Matthew on the point.¹ The allusion in xv. 18-25, xvi. 1-4 to the Jews and the end of the first century cannot be mistaken. That the Jews are intended is shown by the mention of their persecution of Jesus and by xvi. 2, ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς. Exclusion from the synagogue is a step that only Jews, not Gentiles, could take and we have already seen the reflection of contemporary conditions in the exclusion of the Christians from the synagogues both here and at ix. 22, xii. 42. But xvi. 2, ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς, shows to what extremes persecution had gone. Justin has a relevant passage (*Dial. cum Tryph.* xvi. 4): οὐ γὰρ ἔξουσίαν ἔχετε αὐτόχειρες γενέσθαι ἡμῶν διὰ τοὺς νῦν ἐπικρατοῦντας ὁσάκις δε ἀν ἐδυνήθητε, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπράξατε. This last clause may report the persecutions under Bar-Kochba (ι *Apol.* xxxi. 6): καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ Ἰουδαικῷ πολέμῳ Βαρχωχέβας, ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀποστάσεως ἀρχηγέτης, Χριστιανὸς μόνος εἰς τιμωρίας δεινάς, εἰ μὴ ἀρνοῦντο Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ βλασφημοῦν, ἐκέλευν ἀπάγεσθαι. This would, of course, refer to the Christians in Palestine, and presumably Jewish Christians. The wrath of Bar-Kochba against adherents of a rival Messiah can be well understood, but the hostility between Pharisaic and Christian Judaism was of longer standing, and we can imagine that between the death of James in A.D. 62 and the rising of A.D. 132-5 other executions and murders may have taken place as opportunity arose. This would be borne out by the Fourth Gospel.

We may conclude from this that Jewish measures against Christians, especially Jewish Christians, at the time of our Gospel included controversy and propaganda, exclusion from the synagogues, persecution, and even death. The considerable agreement of the documents on this point makes it well nigh impossible that the references to these measures, including the last, are at all exaggerated. It remains to see how far they are to be traced in Matthew.

We have an explicit allusion to controversy in Matt. xxviii. 15, a verse which reveals the intention of xxvii. 62-6, xxviii. 11-15. There is no similar statement about the purpose of the Nativity stories, but we have seen reasons for thinking that there, too,

¹ Cf. *Judaism and Christianity*, i, *The Age of Transition*, 169 f., where it is suggested that circumcision was a bone of contention.

apologetic motives have been at work. In its doctrine of Christ, which we have found to be no mean one, the Gospel put in the forefront the main issue of controversy.

Some of the controversial issues that are handled in other books are absent from Matthew, while others are treated in a different way. In the books of this time there is no mention of circumcision as a controversial subject. The Sabbath¹ and the disputes over its observance are kept, as being firmly fixed in the tradition. Mark i. 23-8, a healing on the Sabbath, disappears, though that may be for other reasons. It is implied in the context that Mark i. 29-34 happens on the Sabbath, but in Matt. viii. 14-17 this implication is absent. Mark ii. 23-8 is taken over at Matt. xii. 1-8, but in the transference a number of significant changes are made. In Matt. xii. 1, the addition of *ἐπείνασαν*, to which nothing corresponds in Mark ii. 23, indicates that the disciples' action is not wanton. Verses 5-7 add another parallel for lawful breaking of the Sabbath. This neglect of the Sabbath in the Temple was a recognized exception to the rule in Pharisaic casuistry. Likewise, in the succeeding story of the Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand, the addition of vv. 11-12a advances an accepted practice in extenuation of the breach of the Sabbath in healing. Mark ii. 27, which might have inspired an excessive laxity, disappears. In this connexion the addition of *μηδὲ σαββάτῳ*, not in Mark, at Matt. xxiv. 20 is significant. From these passages it may be inferred that the Gospel is concerned not so much with the question of keeping the Sabbath at all, as with the question of how rigidly it was to be kept. Though the evangelist indicates a more flexible practice, he has drawn much nearer the Mishna. There is no story or saying certainly derived from Q which deals with the keeping of the Sabbath, so that we cannot make any inference from the way in which the evangelist treats his Q material.² It is to be noted that, while he is careful to reduce the differences in practice and teaching between Jesus and the Rabbis, the claim, xii. 6, *λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἵεροῦ μετζόν ἐστιν ὡδε*, with its Christological implications shows that, even in relation to the Sabbath, the fundamental difference remains unmitigated.

This is equally true of controversy over the Law.³ The evidence has already been explored. We found that the Gospel allows a

¹ On the Sabbath see Abrahams, *Studies*, vol. i, chap. xvii; Montefiore, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*, 240-4.

² Matt. xii. 11 f., Luke xiv. 4 may perhaps be ascribed to Q.

³ Cf. Branscomb, *Jesus and the Law of Moses*.

place to both the Law and to the oral tradition, whose main difference from that given in Judaism lay in the subordination of the Law to Jesus. In contrast to the implications of the Pauline teaching, this position justified itself in so far as the early Church had to teach and observe an oral tradition or law of some sort, if it was to maintain any moral discipline among its members, especially among its Gentile converts.

Another difference between Jews and Christians lay in their attitude toward the Gentiles. In our Gospel this difference is best examined in the light of the attitude that the book displays towards other groups as well. Matt. xviii. 17, *ἔστω σοι ὥσπερ ὁ ἔθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης*, supplies a reason for this. The Gentile in the Gospel is not treated in isolation. We may first take the publican and the sinner. Jesus' teaching about them is repeated at ix. 9–13, xi. 19. At v. 46 f. the publicans (*οἱ ἀμαρτωλοί* in Luke vi. 32) are put on a level with *ἔθνικοί*, as they are called in xviii. 17, quoted above, while at xxi. 31 f. they are associated with *πόρναι*. From these passages it must be admitted that the publican and the sinner are less sympathetically treated than they are in Luke. On the other hand, xxi. 31 f. indicates an expectation that publicans and harlots will have their place in the Kingdom of Heaven, nor does the evangelist withdraw from the originality of Jesus, as at ix. 13, xi. 19 when his friendship toward sinners is mentioned. This readiness to go outside the pious with the message of religion, recognized in the Gospel, is relevant to the Gentile mission.

Before we pursue this subject farther, it may be of value to see if any references can be discovered in the Gospel to the '*am ha'-arez*'. From the texts just mentioned it seems that, from its associations, the term *ἀμαρτωλός* has a strong force. This does not prevent the word from alluding to the '*am ha'-arez*'. He is contrasted with the Pharisee, xxi. 28–32, where the two sons are not Jew and Gentile but Pharisee and worldling. The expressions, sinner, publican, and harlot, are no harsher than those employed in Rabbinic literature.¹ They are probably contemporary with some of them. It is doubtful whether *οὐχίος* ever has this sense.

The Gentiles on the other hand are prominent. *ἔθνικός* occurs at v. 47, vi. 7, xviii. 17, and recurs in the New Testament only at 3 John 7. It has a derogatory suggestion and lacks nothing of the Rabbinic reserve toward the pagans. When, however, the use of

¹ Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*², vol. i, pp. cvii–cx; ii. 647–69; *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*, 3–15; and Loewe in *Judaism and Christianity*, ii. 46. It may be noted that the expression '*am ha'-arez*' is often used in the texts for an individual.

ἔθνος is examined, the indications are different. In the following passages the word is taken over from Mark, x. 18, xx. 19, 25, xxiv. 7, 14 (Mark xiii. 10). Of these xxiv. 14 alone may be relevant, as it may reflect the opinion that the Gentiles' conversion is one of the features of the end.¹ Mark xi. 17, πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, is not reproduced at Matt. xxi. 13, Luke xix. 46, and this omission can be explained, as far as Matthew is concerned, by the fact that the destruction of the Temple had made it impossible for it to become a house of prayer for all nations. The one passage from Q, Matt. vi. 32, where ἔθνος occurs, does not yield any information. In the following passages there is no parallel to the word in the other Gospels. First come the quotations, iv. 15, xii. 18, 21. Of these iv. 15, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἔθνῶν, and xii. 21, τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν, are particularly important. With xii. 18, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ, may be taken xxv. 32, συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Whether the Gentiles were to have a place in the world to come was a disputed question in Judaism. xxviii. 19 is explicit for the mission to the Gentiles: πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. With this we may put xxi. 43, δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς, a statement intruded into the parable by the evangelist. On the other side must be put εἰς ὅδὸν ἔθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε at x. 5 and xxiv. 9, ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνῶν, where τῶν ἔθνῶν is not in Mark xiii. 13. This last saying, however, does not relate to the Gentile mission but to the fact of Gentile persecution.

Among passages where the term ἔθνος does not occur, but which are relevant to our inquiry, the following deserve notice. In the story of the centurion's servant, viii. 5–13, the introduction from another Q context of vv. 11 f., which are not in the Lucan parallel, makes the story a forecast of the conversion of the Gentiles. The implication of xxi. 28–xxii. 14 is the same. xxi. 28–32 is concerned with the publicans and harlots, but in conjunction with the two following stories it indicates a missionary sympathy. In xxi. 33–46, vv. 41b, 43, which have no equivalent in Mark, make it clear that the story was understood as indicating the Gentile mission and the rejection of the Jews. The same is true of the Matthean form of the Wedding Feast. Judaism refused the invitation with contumely, and, after its due punishment, others were brought in off the roads in its stead.

On the other side must be put such passages as x. 5, 23, xv. 21–8. The addition of xv. 22–4 emphasizes the opposition both of Jesus and the disciples to healing the woman's daughter, but none

¹ Moore, *Judaism*, i. 346.

the less her importunity is successful. It may be that ver. 23 represents the unwillingness of the original Jewish church to embark on the mission to the Gentiles and then vv. 25-8 would recall that the Gentiles overcame this reluctance. x. 5 may also remind us that the earliest activity of the Church was confined to the Jews, though it is quite clear that the evangelist intended the whole of the missionary charge, ix. 35-x. 33, to apply to the practice and experience of the Church. At x. 18 f., however, it is implied that the disciples will be given a message which is for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews. Verse 23, especially if we read it in the form¹ ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτη, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἔτεραν κἀν ἐκ ταύτης διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἔτεραν ἀμήν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσοντε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἔως ἔλθῃ ὁ νὺν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, cannot mean merely the cities of Palestine. It must be read in the light of such passages as Acts viii. 1-4, ix. 1 f., xi. 19-21. It was St. Paul's custom also in each city that he visited to go first to the Jewish synagogue. If we can interpret the phrase *tὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* as meaning cities in which Jewish communities were to be found, the restrictive implication of the verse disappears. We must remember, too, that the Gospel was probably written outside Palestine. This means that, if explanations such as those above are not accepted for the three passages, we must maintain that they are derived from the early period of the Church in Palestine and have survived merely through conservatism in tradition. If this is so, the passages will indicate the Palestinian origin of our church, while the parts of the Gospel which favour the Gentile mission will represent the contemporary attitude toward the Gentiles.

This brings us to the conclusion of our examination. Here we have to answer two questions: the first, what is the attitude of the Gospel to the Gentile Christians and the Gentile world? and the second, how far was this attitude related to the controversy with Judaism? The evidence as a whole may be taken to suggest that the mission to the Gentiles was accepted without reservation and with it the fact of Gentile Christianity. On the other hand, the distinction between Judaism and paganism had become the distinction between Christianity and paganism. This is clearly indicated by the suggestion of the term *ἔθνικός* and by the fact that *τὰ ἔθνη* are, to begin with, outsiders. The boundary, however, could be, and was to be, crossed, and as there are no indications that the conditions involved for example, circumcision, it is probable that the policy of Christianity as a whole was the policy of our com-

¹ D, L, Θ, fr, fr3, 22, 247, 565, a, b, d, ff^t, g^t, h, k, q, vg. (2 mss.), syr. sin., arm., Orig.

munity. It is clear from Acts that the turning to the pagans away from the Jews must have been offensive to the Pharisees. This brings us back to the relations between the Pharisees and Jewish Christians as depicted in our Gospel.

We may notice the position of the other parties mentioned. There is a decreasing interest in the Herods and Herodians.¹ Herod the Great figures in chapter ii, Herod Antipas in xiv. 1-12, but for Mark viii. 15, *τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου*, we have at Matt. xvi. 6, *Σαδδουκαῖων*, while Mark iii. 6, *'Ηρῳδιανῶν*, is not reproduced. We should expect to find a similar treatment of the Sadducees in view of their loss of importance after A.D. 70. But the name occurs seven times in Matthew, as often as in the whole of the rest of the New Testament together. In Mark it appears at xii. 18 and is reproduced at Luke xx. 27 corresponding to Matt. xxii. 23, cf. 34. In the other five passages in Matthew it occurs in the phrase *Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι*. None of these references indicates at all a friendly attitude toward them. The only passage which gives further information about them is Matt. xxii. 23-32 from Mark xii. 18-27. Here a difference between Matthew and Mark is to be noticed. In Mark the Sadducees are introduced as follows: *καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ τινες λέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι*: the Sadducees are the party in Judaism which denies a resurrection. Matt. xxii. 23 reads: *προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι λέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι*: from this modification we need infer only that there were Sadducees who denied a resurrection, not that they did so as a party. This suggests that, in Matthew, Sadducee was a more inclusive term than it was in Mark and in history, that it embraces all non-Christian, non-Pharisaic Jews, corresponding to the Rabbinic use of Minim, with the Christian Jews excluded. That such Jews existed at this time is quite clear from Jewish sources.² Indeed, it may be said that the Minim in general get at least as much attention from the Rabbis as the Christians in particular. They are designated as heretics and apostates, *tradidores*, Epicureans, deniers of the Tora, those who have separated themselves from the ways of the community, those who confess not the resurrection of the dead, those who have sinned and made the people to sin, and those who have stretched out their hand against the Temple.³ It is noteworthy that in this list those who deny the resurrec-

¹ For a recent discussion of the precise meaning of the term 'Herodian' in the Gospels see *J.T.S.* xli. 14-27. Josephus' references to the *'Ηρῳδεῖοι* and kindred phrases may reward further study.

² Cf. Strack, op. cit., §§ 18, 19.

³ *Tosephtha Sanhedrin*, xiii. 4 f.; cf. Strack, § 19c.

tion of the dead form one group of sectaries, cf. *Midrash Rabba Ezod. xxxii. 13.* We may accordingly infer that by *Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι* the evangelist denotes Pharisaic and non-Pharisaic Jews, the whole of non-Christian Jewry. The one reference to the Samaritans, x. 5, *εἰς πόλιν Σαμαριτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθητε*, shows the point of view of Rabbinic Judaism.¹

Thus the Pharisees were the one important Jewish sect contemporary with Matthew. It may be stated at once that their relations with Christianity had changed since Mark. In Mark the differences between Jesus and the Pharisees lie in certain controversial issues, just as they did between the various schools of thought within Pharisaism itself. In Matthew the animus is directed more and more against the Pharisees themselves in distinction from the controversial issues. For example at Matt. iii. 7, *πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων*, for which Luke iii. 7 has *τοὺς ἐκπορευομένους δόχλους*, shows that the abusive phrase *γεννήματα ἔχοντῶν* is directed in part at any rate against the Pharisees. The introduction of the Pharisees at Matt. xii. 24, 38 makes it clear that at xii. 34, too, *γεννήματα ἔχοντῶν* was aimed at them. How much Matt. v. 20 owes to the evangelist we do not know, but it is in accordance with this point of view that ix. 13 is directed against them, too. x. 17 ff. alludes to persecution in the synagogues, though the Pharisees are not named. With this agrees xii. 7, *οὐκ ἀν κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναιτίους*, an insertion into a Marcan passage relating to the Pharisees. Matt. xii. 38, *τινες τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαῖων* (Luke xi. 29 does not mention them) ask for a sign. The phrase with which they are condemned, *γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλίς*, is stronger than that in Luke. At Matt. xv. 1-20 the addition of vv. 12-14 turns the passage from mere controversy into an attack on the Pharisees themselves. The most explicit statement of the community's attitude is in xxiii. 2 f. Here the Pharisees and Scribes are distinguished from their teaching. The teaching is accepted but the men themselves are condemned. From this we must not infer that the controversies had been lost sight of in a mutual antipathy, but that they had hardened into a sectarian hostility. The issue of Christ against the Law had become also the opposition of the Church and the Synagogue.

There is evidence in the Gospel that this opposition had led to persecution from the side of the synagogue. The following passages suggest that propaganda and delation were practised, v. 11 beside Luke vi. 22, Matt. xv. 19, *ψευδομαρτυρίαι*, xxiv. 10, though we cannot be sure that the delators were Pharisees. After A.D. 135 the

¹ *Tosephia Hullin*, ii. 20-1; cf. *Bab. Hullin*, 13 a. b.

Jews themselves suffered considerably from delation. The Jewish Christians experienced, as had St. Paul, the discipline of the synagogue, xxiii. 34, with which we may compare x. 17 from Mark xiii. 9. They were chased from town to town, x. 23, xxiii. 34, and were put to death, xxii. 6, by stoning, xxi. 35, or by crucifixion, xxiii. 34.¹ These references are to passages which are in their form peculiar to the Gospel and are frequently due to the rewriting of the sources, which suggests that the statements are true for the evangelist's own time. This conclusion is supported by the fact that these statements are in the main in agreement with the evidence, discussed earlier, of other Christian writings of this period. The increased frequency in the use of *διώκειν* in the sense of 'persecute' has already been noticed.

Despite these harsh measures the opposition between Christian and Pharisee is for the evangelist an opposition within Judaism. This is the reason why the church in which he worked was able to take over so much of Jewish thought and practice without weakening its Christian character. The doctrine of Christ is introduced, not as in Marcion's teaching like a razor which shears off every Jewish feature, but as the true end of Judaism on which all the wealth of Jewish life and teaching is focused. We have, in fact, not an elimination of Judaism, but a reorientation. Thus we see why the Gospel is at once so Christian and so Jewish.

We have seen the consequences of this for the relations between Christian and Pharisee; it is now important to consider those for the future of the Church itself. For this it is necessary to remember that the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70 serves as a dividing line. Up to this time it was still possible to be a Christian and remain within Judaism, and the disputes between Christian and Pharisee, like those between Hillelite and Shammaite, between Pharisee and Sadducee, were internal disputes. Likewise, up to A.D. 64 at any rate, the Roman government looked upon Christians as Jews and to be treated as Jews. By A.D. 135 this had all changed. For Christians, Jews, and the Roman government alike, Christianity was a third race, as distinct from Judaism as it was from paganism. This meant that the Church could no longer use the life and institutions of Judaism as common property. It had to build up others around its own religious convictions. It could do this in one or other of two ways. Either it could turn away from Judaism completely and construct a new life and new institutions for itself (the venture of Marcion shows how far the Church was from following

¹ Cf. *Hermas*, vis. III, ii. 1, *στραυπός*.

this policy), or it could take over, as far as its cardinal doctrines allowed, the institutions and life of Judaism. The second was the course that was actually pursued, and in a much fuller degree than is often realized. We can determine the period within which this course was most actively pursued. The influence of Judaism on Christianity after A.D. 132-5 all but ceased, so that the transitional period for Christianity, from a Jewish sect to a religion with a life and structure of its own, must be A.D. 70-130. The importance of our Gospel for this process lies in the fact that it came into being in an essentially Jewish Christian community, where the building up of a church life in independence of contemporary Judaism was in progress. It is significant that the attitude to Judaism displayed by the book enabled this community to take over so much from Judaism and at the same time it radically distinguished the Church from the Synagogue. As has been already suggested, it seems that this was due not to any rejection of Judaism in itself, but to its subordination to the central doctrine of Christ. Judaism as a whole utterly rejected this subordination, so that the breach was inevitable and complete.

VII

THE COMMUNITY OF THE GOSPEL

Summary. Matthew was written in a well-to-do city church. It had its officers and liturgy. Discipline had to meet moral laxness, false doctrine, Messianic pretensions, and persecution. Various pieces of evidence suggest that the church of Matthew is to be found in Syria, probably in Phoenicia, at the end of the first century.

OF the three factors which played a part in the creation of Matthew, that of the sources or material has been dealt with. The second factor, the circumstances of its creation, may now be treated. This treatment consists in giving a picture of the community in which the Gospel was written. At once, however, we realize that in Chapters V and VI much of this picture has already been given in the account of the liturgical background of the book and of its relation to Judaism. For this reason the present chapter will be mainly concerned in supplying the rest of the picture. This will lead to a review of the conclusions of Chapter I about the place and date at which the Gospel was composed and enable us to summarize our conclusions on this point.

In our account of the Matthean church we must first look at its composition. We have already seen that its members were Greek-speaking Jews in contact with Rabbinical culture, but in strongest opposition to Rabbinical Judaism. To these facts others may now be added.

If we compare Mark and Matthew we find reason for thinking that Matthew was written for a city church. In Mark *πόλις* occurs 8 times. At i. 33 it describes Capernaum, at v. 14 Gerasa, and at xi. 19, xiv. 13, 16 Jerusalem. At v. 14 it is distinguished from the country, while at vi. 56 it is distinct from country and villages. Mark i. 33, 45, are not produced in Matthew at all, while much of Mark vi. 56, xiv. 16 is left out. The remaining four occurrences reappear in Matthew. On the other hand, *πόλις* is used 26 times in Matthew, 3 of them coming from Q. Jerusalem is referred to at iv. 5, v. 35, xxi. 10, 17, 18, xxii. 7, xxvi. 18, xxvii. 53, xxviii. 11, Nazareth at ii. 23, Capernaum at ix. 1, Gadara at viii. 33, 34 Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum at xi. 20. At ix. 35 city is distinguished from village. Here the term has been inserted by the evangelist into Mark vi. 6 as it has at viii. 34, xxi. 10, 18. *κώμη* appears in Mark 7 times. In Matthew it is reproduced only thrice. At Matt. x. 11 ἡ *κώμην* should be omitted with D, fam. 1, 700, a, b,

d, ff¹, h, k, syr. sin., Hil; the words are added after *εἰσέλθητε* in L, fam. 13, *geog.* 1, Mark v. 14, vi. 36, 56, use the plural *ἀργοί* as equivalent to the country as distinct from the town. This usage is not reproduced in Matthew. The preference for the city receives fresh support when it is found that some of the peculiar occurrences of the term seem to relate to the contemporary conditions. At x. 23, xxiii. 34, the disciples flee from city to city; they do not take to the hills as so many persecuted bodies in Palestine had done, Mark xiii. 14, which is, however, retained at Matt. xxiv. 16. On the other hand, this flight from city to city corresponded exactly to St. Paul's conduct in the Diaspora at an earlier date. We may conclude that our Gospel was written in a city community.

The references to money and economic matters agree with this. *χαλκός* is used as the term for money twice in Mark, vi. 8, xii. 41; Mark vi. 8 is reproduced at Matt. x. 9, while the whole of Mark xii. 41-4 is omitted in Matthew. On the other hand, *ἀργύριον* is mentioned in Mark only at xiv. 11. In Matthew it is found 8 or 9 times; at xxvi. 15, for *ἀργύρια, στατῆρας* is read by D, a, b, d, q, ^{r^{1,2}}, Eus. (2), Orig., while in fam. 1, 22, h, both terms appear. At Matt. x. 9 *ἀργυρός* is used. Mark does not refer to gold but it occurs at Matt. ii. 11, x. 9, xxiii. 16, 17. Matt. x. 9 is especially important. Here the Christian is counselled: *μή κτήσῃσθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν*, while Mark vi. 8 has only *μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν*. The evidence of the coins mentioned points to the same conditions. Mark has *λεπτόν* and *κοδράντης*, xii. 42, and *δηνάριον*, vi. 37, xii. 15, xiv. 5. Matthew does not mention the *λεπτόν* and his lowest term is *κοδράντης* v. 26. As well as these there are the *δηνάριον*, xviii. 28, xx. 2, 9, 10, 13, xxii. 19, the *διδραχμα*, xvii. 24 (2), *στατήρ*, xvii. 27 and perhaps xxvi. 16, while the talent occurs 14 or 15 times. It is noteworthy that in Luke xix. 11-27 the servants operate with minas, but in Matt. xxv. 14-30 with talents. These details together point to a community of greater wealth, accustomed to a much wider financial range than that in Mark. Because of wealthier conditions, where Luke was content to write *μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί* (vi. 20), the evangelist restricts this *μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*; for his community, it is a spiritual condition and not material poverty that is blessed. Apart from this the word *πτωχός*, which occurs in Mark 5 times, appears in Matthew only thrice, all from Mark. At xi. 5 *καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται* is to be omitted. At Luke vii. 22, xiv. 21 *πτωχός* is used in Q contexts, but is lacking in the corresponding passages in Matthew. The references to a wide range of money and the little concern about poverty would agree

more with a rich city community than with a country one with its limited economy.

We can trace something, too, of its organization, worship, and discipline. The twelve are figures of the past. In Mark they appear 10 times, in Matthew 9. Once they are called ἀπόστολοι in a different context from the one occurrence in Mark, vi. 30. On the other hand, St. Peter occupies a very important position and, as we have seen, he is connected with authority, rulings, and discipline of the Church. We have not the clue to this fact, but it may be related to another, that Jerusalem and Antioch provide the earliest undisputed examples of monarchical episcopate. At Jerusalem there is James, followed by Simeon, who was martyred at the beginning of the second century, and at Antioch, where Peter seems to have occupied a leading position, Ignatius, c. A.D. 115, provides the earliest exposition of episcopacy. It may be that the relation of Peter to his fellow apostles, that of *primus inter pares*, represents an early stage of the episcopate in the Levant, where the bishop is chairman among equipollent colleagues, while Ignatius would represent a further development.

We reach more solid ground when we look for the other officers of the church. *πρεσβύτεροι* in Matthew are always leaders of the Jews, while *διάκονοι* are not officers of the church. *ἐπίσκοποι* are not mentioned. On the other hand, as we have seen, there are *γραμματεῖς*, xiii. 52, xxiii. 34, and *σόφοι* (*hakhamim*), xxiii. 34, and the rejection of the titles *ῥαββί*, *καθηγητής*, xxiii. 8, 10, implies that there were those who did this work. At x. 41, xxiii. 34, though the former context is from Mark and the latter from Q, the mention of the *προφήτης* is peculiar to Matthew. At vii. 15, xxiv. 11, which are peculiar verses, we have *ψευδοπροφῆται*. Thus our church has a ministry of prophets and teachers. The Jewish designations of these last are noteworthy.

The prophets and teachers probably found room for some of their activities in the worship of the church. We have seen that the Gospel was intended to take its place in the reading from Holy Writ and in exposition. Besides the lessons and the sermons we find traces of liturgical prayer in the remodelling of the Lord's Prayer at vi. 9-13. The liturgical changes which Lohmeyer found in the Matthean version of the Last Supper, especially when they are taken with the addition of *εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν* at xxvi. 28, suggest that this was a regular part of the church's worship. This would in its main features differ little from what we should expect the worship of a church at the end of the first century to be.

Discipline had two tasks. One was to maintain the moral standards that it inherited. In this connexion Matt. xxv. 31-46 is an impressive exhortation to good works. xxiv. 12 points to a certain moral laxity. *ἀνομία*, vii. 23, xiii. 41, xxiii. 28, xxiv. 12, occurs only in Matthew outside the Epistles, and all four passages are on other grounds suspect as being of late origin. Against these shortcomings there is the eschatological appeal, vii. 22 f., xvi. 27, xxv. 31-46, and the call to good works, v. 13-16. Excommunication is to be used with a moderation that contrasts with the harsh rulings of Hebrews and of much of the early Church, xiii. 36-43, 47-50, xviii. 12-35. The officers of the Church are to aim at the recovery of the erring member, not at rigour in their discipline.

The second task of discipline was to guard against false doctrine. At Mark xiii. 22, the true text may read *ψευδοπροφῆται* without *ψευδόχριστοι* (so D, 124, 1573, i, k), in which case *ψευδόχριστοι* will be a harmonization due to Matthew. The evangelist, by adding *ὁ Χριστός* at xxiv. 5, had already alluded to false Messiahs. False prophets are mentioned thrice in Matthew against Mark's once. They lead many astray, xxiv. 11, and cause havoc, vii. 15.

Persecution we have already dealt with. It would be a mistake to think that it had at this time fallen into the background.¹ Thus the Church, having to face moral laxity, the peril of false doctrine, and persecution from Jew and Gentile, required all the help that leaders, organization, and teaching could give it. If we compare these dangers and the measures taken against them with what we find in other books, we see that the comparison supports the conclusion that the Gospel belongs toward the end of the first century, a conclusion that supports our preliminary inference in Chapter I. We can, then, suggest that the picture we draw from the data of the Gospel points to a community existing at this date as the kind of church in which the Gospel was produced.

This agreement with our provisional dating of Chapter I encourages us to examine how far our other suggestions about the Gospel agree with this date. Particularly relevant are the relations that seem to have existed between the evangelist's community and Judaism, the relation of our liturgical theory to the documentary hypothesis, and the independence from Paulinism displayed in the book. There will also be one or two subsidiary arguments to consider.

We have seen that, during A.D. 70-135, Rabbinical Judaism followed the same policy toward Jewish Christians as it did toward other Jewish dissentients. They had to conform or leave

¹ Bacon, op. cit., 77.

Judaism. Among the earliest measures taken against Christians was the inclusion of the *Birkath ha-Minim* in the eighteen Benedictions of the synagogue liturgy. This cannot be put earlier than A.D. 80. If we are right in finding traces in the Gospel of this and the other measures taken by the Rabbis against Christianity, it becomes impossible to date the book before A.D. 90, since the policy had to be devised and put into practice, and had to affect the lives of Jewish Christians sufficiently for them to record their protest. This protest again had to react so strongly on the evangelical documents of the community that it became a traditional element in their understanding and exposition. The earliest other Christian document to show traces of the *Birkath ha-Minim* is John, usually dated about A.D. 96.

A date such as this would agree with the indications that the Gospel was used liturgically. On our hypothesis the Gospel was composed of three documentary sources together with a number of unwritten traditions; these sources had been used in the worship of the church long enough for an homiletic context to be gathered round them, which itself became traditional and reacted on the form of the sources. It may be assumed that the documentary sources were in being by A.D. 70 and were perhaps in use in our church about A.D. 75. Then they had to undergo in the liturgy that regular exposition which in time built up a traditional exegesis of the text. It is difficult to see how this process could have been effected before A.D. 90.

To this may be added certain suggestions that come from the study of the unwritten tradition embodied in the Gospel. From an examination of xxvii. 3-10, for example, it seems probable that this tradition was derived from a Semitic source but that that source lies some way behind and has been partially defaced and misunderstood. A similar conclusion may be reached from the study of the Birth stories. Here we may detect an element of older tradition round which have been built a number of stories of later date. Elsewhere we can perceive features which accord with the traditions of other Gospels and which should therefore be earlier. Such features are the Appearance in Galilee after the Resurrection and the Charge to the Disciples. On the other hand, some of the details of these two accounts seem to be late, as is the story of the Guard at the Tomb. An example of such lateness is the Trinitarian formula of xxviii. 19. If we are right in suggesting that one or two of the Petrine stories were originally Resurrection stories which have been deliberately transferred to contexts pre-

vious to the Resurrection, we have another illustration of the probability that the unwritten tradition had a history, and it seems a long history, before it was recorded in our Gospel. The indications of this argument do not point to so precise a date as do the two previous ones, but it suggests the same period for the composition of our book.

If these considerations appear strongly to support the thesis that the Gospel cannot be put earlier than A.D. 90 and should probably be dated later, are there any arguments that may be held to supply a *terminus ad quem*? First we may take the evidence to be derived from the mention of the poll-tax at xvii. 24-7. When this passage was discussed in Chapter III, it was noted that Nerva abolished the liability to the tax both for Jews and for Christians and that the ignorance of Rabbis on points of detail shows that the tax was by then obsolete. This favours the view that the story was recorded in the Gospel very little after A.D. 97 at the latest. This conclusion supports a *terminus ad quem* of A.D. 100.

The evidence from the relation of the Gospel to Paulinism and the Pauline Epistles points to a similar result. If we look through the literature of the Apostolic Fathers we are struck by the knowledge of the Pauline Epistles that most of them display. 1 Clement used Romans and 1 Corinthians, Barnabas Romans, Ignatius 1 Corinthians and Ephesians with perhaps Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians, Polycarp all except Colossians and 1 Thessalonians, and Hermas 1 Corinthians and Ephesians. This makes it clear that all Christian writings produced after A.D. 100 showed some knowledge of the Pauline Epistles and the nearer to this date we place a writing the more we expect to find traces of St. Paul.

In our Gospel, however, there is no sign that the Epistles were known. It is hard to believe that the evangelist would have written Matt. xxviii. in its present form, had he known 1 Cor. xv. Yet from our list of users of the Epistles, it is clear that we have the earliest and widest evidence of the use of 1 Corinthians. The attitude to the Law is different. It seems as though sometimes for St. Paul the Law and Christ are mutually exclusive. In our Gospel Christ is the complement of the old Law and the giver of the new. The evangelist's doctrine of the Law is as different from that of some of the Pauline pronouncements as it is from Pharisaism. Both are exclusive, the one of the Law and the other of Christ, while in our Gospel adjustment and not exclusion is the method followed. It may be for this reason that the controversy over the

Law is not so extreme in Matthew as it is in Mark. Likewise δικαιοσύνη has not the same moral and theological suggestion as it has for St. Paul, but means rather the fulfilling of the Law, a practical activity of man and not a status conferred of grace by God. This is true even of Matt. vi. 1-18, where almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, the traditional expressions of repentance in Judaism, are associated with the forgiveness of sins and included under the heading of δικαιοσύνη. Here the emphasis is on the human aspect and the human activities rather than, as in St. Paul, on what God does. The Pauline doctrine of grace is absent, nor does the word χάρις itself occur. The idea of incorporation into the Church as the body of Christ is not mentioned, though ἐκκλησία appears twice. The Gospel shows no sign of any use of the Pauline Epistles, even where we might expect it, and its ideas are quite different from those of the Apostle. This leads us to infer that the evangelist and the church for which he wrote were as yet unaffected by Paulinism and unacquainted with the Pauline Epistles. Such a state of affairs is extremely hard to imagine in a city church of any importance outside Palestine after A.D. 100, and not easy after A.D. 90.

In conclusion we may say that, if the arguments from the liturgical background of the Gospel, from its relations with Judaism and from the nature of the unwritten tradition used in it, favour a date after A.D. 90, the complete ignorance of the Pauline Epistles and independence of their doctrine shown in the Gospel, the reference to the poll-tax, together with the evidence treated in Chapter I, indicate A.D. 100 as a *terminus ad quem*. This conclusion supports the preliminary inference made in Chapter I. Any attempt at further definition of the date involves a discussion of the location of the community in which the Gospel was written.

In trying to find the place of origin of the Gospel, we have to relate our inquiry to the ignorance of St. Paul's teaching and writings that we have discovered in it. This is because, if we were to imagine that the Gospel was written at Antioch, we should expect Pauline influence much earlier there than in some of the less important Christian churches. This is supported by the fact that Ignatius is already acquainted with some of the Epistles by A.D. 115. Earlier, St. Paul himself had had a very close connexion with Antioch, and since this connexion was still remembered when the Acts were written, it is very unlikely that Antioch would be late in coming to use the Epistles. It was an important church, in frequent contact with the other chief centres of Christianity at this period, and we should not expect it to be behindhand in

acquaintance with and use of the writings of the Apostle. This fact, taken with the absence of any Pauline contacts in the Gospel, appears to make it necessary either to put the date of the Gospel early, not later than A.D. 90 for example, or else to keep a later date for the Gospel and to look for some other place than Antioch, where Pauline influence would be later in coming into effect.

A way out of this impasse may be indicated by the Fourth Gospel. According to tradition and most modern opinion this was written in Asia at the end of the first century. Asia was probably the centre where the collection of Pauline Epistles was made, and indeed Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon were written to destinations within the province, while 1 Corinthians and perhaps part of 2 Corinthians were written from it. Consequently we may assume that some, at any rate, of the Epistles were known there from A.D. 80. Yet the Fourth Gospel goes on its course in considerable independence, we cannot say ignorance, of the Pauline literature. The ideas are different and there is no proved borrowing in point of fact. This contemporary analogy may remove a difficulty in associating Matthew with a community such as Antioch despite the absence of Pauline contacts in the book.

Having relieved ourselves of this difficulty we may now put together what facts we know about our community which would help us to identify it. Its only language is Greek, but its way of life and thought is Jewish and it is in close contact with Rabbinical Judaism. It is a fairly wealthy city community, but with no signs of Hellenistic influence such as we should expect at Alexandria, though it was in contact with pagans as well as with Jews. The evangelist's rearrangements of the Marcan order show that he lacks an intimate knowledge of Palestine and is working at second hand. Apart from what is supplied by Mark we find no such topographical details as occur in John.¹

On the other hand the Gospel has a number of contacts with Syria, especially with Phoenicia. At Matt. iv. 24 Συρίαν has no equivalent in the Marcan parallels.² It was noted in Chapter III above that σεισμός, σείειν were favourite expressions in Matthew. The facts are as follows: σεισμός occurs in Matthew 4 times, Mark, Luke, and Acts each once, and Revelation 7 times, and σείειν Matthew 3, Hebrews and Revelation each once. At Matt. xxiv. 7 σεισμός is taken over from Mark xiii. 8. At Matt. viii. 24 it is intro-

¹ Cf. J.B.L. lx. 9–13.

² The variant in Γ, συνοπίαν favoured by Blass and Moffatt, is an error. The same mistake occurs at Herodotus, v. 49. 6 where for Συρίου one manuscript reads Συνοπίους.

duced into a passage from Mark. At xxvii. 54, xxviii. 2 it is used in sections apparently first put into writing by the evangelist. He seems to have been responsible for the phrasing at xxi. 10, xxvii. 51, xxviii. 4, verses peculiar to the Gospel, where *σείειν* occurs. We may attribute his use of the words to the influence of apocalyptic, but a further reason may be found in the fact that from the days of Ras Shamra until modern times the Levant has been liable to earthquakes.

There is one slight indication that may point to the Mediterranean coast. In his own composition the evangelist uses for the Sea of Galilee not *θάλασσα*, but *τὰ ὕδατα* viii. 32, xiv. 28, 29. This can be understood if we may assume that he himself reserved *θάλασσα* for the Mediterranean. In the same way, at xviii. 6, for Mark's *βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* he has *καταποντισθῆ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης*, a clause that would recall the high sea of the Mediterranean as distinct from an inland lake.

Another piece of evidence in favour of Phoenicia may be found in the story of the Canaanite woman. In Mark vii. 26 she is described as *'Ελληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει*, that is, a native of Phoenicia with pretensions to Greek culture, but in Matt. xv. 22 she is described as *Xavavalā*, a term whose connexions are not with the Greek but with the Semitic world. Why has the change been made? An inquiry into one meaning of the term, Canaanite, and into the spread of Hellenism at this time may provide a reason for it. In the period after the Old Testament, apart from its other uses, we find Canaan employed as an equivalent of Phoenicia. Already at Gen. x. 15 we have 'Canaan begat Zidon his firstborn' and the Carthaginians called themselves not *Poeni* but Canaanites. Later evidence is provided by the LXX. For example, at Exod. vi. 15, xvi. 35, Joshua v. 1, 12, Job xl. 30 the Hebrew has Canaan, Canaanite, but the LXX Phoenicia, Phoenician. Later still at Dan. Sus. 56 the LXX has Sidon, but Theodotion substitutes Canaan. The date of the LXX of Susanna is uncertain but it cannot well be earlier than 50 B.C. Lastly in the phrase 'profectionis fynicis' (= Phoenices) at the beginning of the *Assumption of Moses* Phoenice stands for Canaan. The patriarchs had no contacts with Phoenicia proper. The *Assumption* belongs to the first half of the first century A.D. These pieces of evidence taken together suggest that Canaan was still current as the Semitic equivalent of Phoenicia not so long before Matthew was written, and enable us to see that the change at Matt. xv. 22 is not haphazard, but do not help us to perceive the reason for it.

At this point we may gain more light by considering the influence of the Greek point of view in the Middle East at the time of Matthew. The villages and country-side remained little affected by it, retaining their native customs and Semitic speech. The cities for the most part eagerly accepted the Greek language, and this was especially true of such Phoenician ports as Tyre, Berytus, Sidon.¹ We have seen that Matthew was written in a Greek-speaking community with little or no contact with any Semitic tongue, probably in a Syrian port. Hence the change at Matt. xv. 22 seems to divert the reference of the story from the inhabitants of the great ports with their Hellenic pretensions, so aptly described in Mark's phrase, to the villagers who were relatively untouched by Hellenism and remained Semitic in speech and outlook. When we consider the story we can understand why on this hypothesis the change might be desired. The story is not complimentary to the woman and her people. The phrase in Mark would relate it to the Hellenizing cities of the coast, the term in Matthew to the more Semitic country-side. If we may suppose that Matthew was produced in one of the coast cities, the evangelist has in effect diverted the distasteful implications of the story from his own community to the conservative villagers. Even if this explanation does not commend itself, the evidence of the LXX shows that the change was topical and suggests that Matthew was connected in some way with Phoenicia.

We have already noted the suggestion that the Gospel was written at Antioch. This would satisfy some of our requirements. It was a Greek foundation and Greek was the language of the city. It had a Jewish community and its Christian church was of early foundation and of importance, in touch both with Palestine and with other centres of Christianity. On the other hand it was far enough away from Palestine to account for an inexactness in knowledge of the province. In Syria, it was quite close to the Mediterranean, and Ignatius, its Bishop, was the first to show any acquaintance with the Gospel and that not long after it was written. It would also soon feel the effect of any measures taken by Judaism against Christianity. The rival of Alexandria, it always displayed an independence in thought which would account for the absence in Matthew of the similarities to Philo which we find in the Fourth Gospel. The tendency of Antioch was to be Aristotelian and matter of fact, a point of view which would accord better with our book.

¹ Cf. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, especially the chapter on Syria, for the Hellenism of the cities and the Semitic character of the country-side.

In Syria, too, as we know from Celsus, there were eschatological claimants in plenty and the writer of our Gospel was aware of them, calling them false Christs and false prophets.

There are other arguments which point to the same conclusion. The Gospel shows a peculiar interest in St. Peter and a peculiar rehandling of the Petrine material. The reason for this rehandling is unknown, but it is quite clear that for the Gospel St. Peter was an important figure just as it has been surmised from Galatians that he played an important part in the early history of the church at Antioch. The two other churches with which we know that he was connected, Jerusalem and Rome, are both out of the question.

On the other hand there are reasons for hesitating to accept the claims of Antioch. Ignatius, who may have been bishop there when Matthew was written, shows no trace of the Jewish influence which is so strong in the Gospel and *ex hypothesi* in the community in which it originated. Perhaps the absence of Pauline influence is not to be explained away by a reference to the parallel of John, as Ignatius alludes to Pauline epistles.¹ Except for the pre-eminence of Peter, the indications of Matthew do not favour Antioch to the exclusion of the Syrian ports. On the other hand the story of the Canaanite woman may be evidence for the Phoenician cities against Antioch. The presence of Peter at Antioch in Gal. ii. 11 ff. neither gives him an outstanding position there nor excludes the possibility that he may have had connexions with Phoenicia. There may be one small piece of evidence against associating him too closely with Antioch. From Acts xi. 19–26 Antioch seems to have been the centre of the Gentile mission, but according to Gal. ii. 8 Peter was called to the ministry of the circumcision. This would bring him and our Gospel together and separate both from Antioch.

The difficulties in the way of placing Matthew at Antioch do not apply to the Phoenician cities. They were busy, wealthy seaports in Syria, largely Greek in speech and early homes of Christianity. One advantage they have over Antioch. Matthew originated in a community in close contact with the Judaism of Jamnia. This is much more likely to be true of the Christian community in Tyre, for example, than of that at Antioch. If we must select one of the southern Phoenician cities, Tyre or Sidon would meet the requirements of Matthew as well as anywhere, but perhaps it is better to rest content with the general suggestion of Phoenicia as the place of origin.

¹ Cf. p. 130 f. above.

VIII

THE EVANGELIST

Summary. The evangelist's contribution to Matthew is hard to disentangle as his outlook is very like that of the community for which he wrote. Himself a Christian scribe, he is responsible for the structure of his book, he was the first to put the peculiar narratives into writing and he fitted the Gospel for liturgical use. Matthew was probably an official undertaking, deliberately pseudonymous from the beginning.

THE third factor in the composition of the Gospel was the evangelist, and in treating of him we have to discuss his contribution to the creation of the book and the question of authorship. This, of course, cannot become an attempt to give a full-length portrait of the evangelist himself.

In an undertaking of this kind, we meet at once with a difficulty. How is it possible to distinguish what comes from the evangelist from what comes from the other two factors of the material and circumstances of the book? There is the same difficulty in distinguishing between these, but it is less acute because there is a considerable amount which can, beyond reasonable dispute, be assigned to each of them. What can in the same way be assigned to the evangelist is much smaller and less informative.

Among the elements which most surely derive from the writer is not a little of the detail and the main plan of the book. It is in the main plan that a comparison with Mark is most instructive. In Mark i. 1-15 there is a sequence of events and from Mark xi onward an order, either already present or coming into being, which may run back into Mark x. But between these two points we are confronted with the amorphous tradition of the Galilean ministry to which the words of Papias *οὐ μέντοι τάξει* well apply. We may indeed detect small groups in the material, but any attempt to find an order or systematic arrangement of the whole comes to grief. When we turn to Matthew, we find a quite different state of affairs. In Matt. iii-xxv, corresponding to Mark i-xiii, lies the core of the Matthean arrangement of material. Matt. i-ii, xxvi-xxviii serve as a kind of prologue and epilogue to the central part of the book whose grouping deserves examination. In it there are five sections, each divided as follows:

Book I. (a) iii. iv. Narrative.

(b) v-vii. Sermon on the Mount.

Book II. (a) viii-ix. Narrative.

(b) x-xi. i. Discourse on Apostleship.

- Book III. (a) xi. 2-xii. Reception of the Message.
 (b) xiii. 1-52. Parables.
- Book IV. (a) xiii. 53-xvii. 21. Narrative and Teaching.
 (b) xvii. 22-xix. 1. Discussion on Church Administration.
- Book V. (a) xix. 2-xxii. Narrative and Teaching.
 (b) xxiii-xxv. Eschatological Discourse.

This division is clearly modelled on the book of the Law and implies a contrast between Jesus and the Law which indicates both the Jewish background of the book and its Christological point of view. But this arrangement could only come from the author of the book, since it is not in the tradition, and circumstances and communities do not create books of themselves. We have seen that the Gospel's Christology and relation to Judaism are representative of the church for which it was written. From these data we can argue for an identity of outlook between the evangelist and his community on the two most important features of the book.

In the details of order it is not so easy to detect the evangelist's hand. Some of the rearrangements of the material of Mark i. 29-vi. 13 in Matt. viii-xiii are determined by his scheme for Matt. iii-xxv. On the other hand in Chapter V reason has been given for thinking that some at least of the grouping of sources within the sections is due to the needs and traditions of homiletic exposition.

In summarizing our conclusions about the structure and order of the book, we may say that it is the most practical of the Gospels. If any passage or text is in Matthew as well as in one or more of the other Gospels, it is easiest to find it in Matthew. This power of serviceable arrangement seems to distinguish our author among the evangelists.

When the peculiar narratives were examined, it seemed probable that the composer of the Gospel was the first to put them into writing. This suggests another characteristic of Matthew in which the author's hand may be discovered, that of style and language. Further light on this is given when his rehandling of the Marcan material is recalled. The meticulous revision that much of this material has undergone in its incorporation into Matthew can in large measure be due only to the writer, and accords with the evidence of his style apparent in the peculiar narratives. This style lacks the ruggedness of Mark or of St. Paul's Epistles, the brilliant mastery of Greek shown in the Epistle to the Hebrews, or the variety of imitation apparent in the Lucan writings. By comparison it is undistinguished, but neat, clear, and direct,

possessing the character of serviceability rather than distinction. Hence it does not attract or distract the attention and is yet not undignified. In this way the liturgical purpose of the book is admirably served.

In the examination of the liturgical features we noted a number of details which were due not to the previous use of the book but apparently to the intention of fitting it to serve as a lectionary text in the church's services. These could only come from the writer and, if he purposely set out to produce a book for this end, two things should be clear. First that he was in closest contact with the church's liturgical tradition and secondly that to compose a Gospel for the church's public use he had to stand in some relation to the church. In view of his harmony with its outlook and customs he probably occupied some position in it.

We have seen that among the ministers of our community was the scribe, and such our evangelist seems to have been. To have reproduced the Rabbinical colouring in the material, he would have to be himself expert in Rabbinical lore. He alone mentions the Christian scribe with approval. If he held such a position, it would account for his assuming the task of writing a new Gospel for his community. That he fulfilled this task so successfully seems due to his gifts and suitability for it, his gift of style and construction, his harmony with his church and Christian background, and his ability to adapt varied materials to his purpose. These gifts did not attract notice but they achieved their end, and in so doing enable us to catch a glimpse of the man himself who was able with such skill to bring out of his treasury things both new and old.

If the evangelist was a scribe in his community and undertook this work for the worship of the church, the question arises: was the Gospel an official or a private writing? The need for one book instead of the two or three previously used must have been felt and recognized as much by the leaders of the Church as by its rank and file. Further, in order to pass into public use at all, the Gospel would first need official approval. The fact that the book may have been written about A.D. 100, and was used by Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, about A.D. 115, suggests that production and public recognition could not have been far separated in date. In view of these probabilities we have the alternatives: either a scribe of the community on his own account wrote the Gospel for public use and on its appearance it was accepted for public use by the leaders; or the writing of the book was entrusted by them to the evangelist from the beginning. In view of the fact that the Gospel intended

for public use was written by a public person and was soon current, the latter alternative seems to be the more likely.

This raises the question of ascription and authorship. The suggestion was advanced in Chapter I that the false ascription *κατὰ Μαθθαῖον* came into being not later than A.D. 125. This left us with the problem how this ascription was made. We noticed that it was increasingly desirable to distinguish the Gospel from the other three by some name of apostolic weight and in this way *κατὰ Μαθθαῖον* certainly could be compared with *κατὰ Μάρκου*, *κατὰ Λουκᾶν*, *κατὰ Ἰωάννην*. But this still leaves us with the question why the book was designated *κατὰ Μαθθαῖον* instead of *κατὰ Πέτρον* for example.

Mark ii. 14 mentions *Λευεῖν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου*, but the corresponding passage Matt. ix. 9 has just *Μαθθαῖον* and, while Mark iii. 18 has only the name *Μαθθαῖον*, Matt. x. 3 has *Μαθθαῖος ὁ τελώνης*. It is tempting to assume that these changes have some connexion with the title *κατὰ Μαθθαῖον*. This gives two possibilities: either the title came out of this change and was subsequent to it, or else the change and the title were both the work of the evangelist and he deliberately gave the book its pseudonymous heading.

The former possibility means that when it was produced the book was known simply by some such description as *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* and that later, as the advantage of apostolic backing became apparent, on the basis of Matt. ix. 9 the book was entitled *κατὰ Μαθθαῖον*. This involves the theory that the changes at Matt. ix. 9, x. 3 are independent of the title, which does not explain them. Nor is any other explanation apparent. This in itself is no difficulty. We have to admit that, if one or two Petrine stories have suffered changes, for example in being transferred from the Resurrection period to the Galilean ministry, yet no explanation of these changes is forthcoming. To suggest that the wealth of the community would make it interested in the publican among the twelve is to go beyond proof without giving much light on the problem of authorship.

There is a greater difficulty in the former possibility. Even after the changes of Matt. ix. 9, x. 3, Matthew is a much less important figure than Peter and if an apostolic name was to be sought from the contents of the book, it would be expected that Peter would be chosen. The fact that this is not so makes against the possibility that the title of book was subsequent to its production and arose out of Matt. ix. 9, x. 3.

The second possibility makes the book from the beginning

deliberately pseudonymous. This view still preserves a connexion between the two passages in Matthew and the title. We have seen in Chapters I and VII that the book was probably written about A.D. 90-100, and that the title cannot have even come into being later than A.D. 125. These two statements would wholly agree with the book being imputed to the Apostle from the beginning. It would require that the changes at ix. 9, x. 3 and the apostolic title should both go back to the history of the community of which knowledge has been lost. As we have seen, this in itself was no difficulty. It has a bearing on the question whether the writing of the book was an official undertaking or not. A private production claiming apostolic authorship was, as we know of the later Acts of Paul, liable to severe scrutiny. An official work whose pseudonymity was approved by the authorities of the church would not have to meet the guardians of canonicity. Nor need the suggestion of deliberate pseudonymity on the part of the evangelist cause qualms. The ancient feelings and conventions about the practice were different from ours and we have an undoubted example in the New Testament in 2 Peter.

As it is doubtful whether more can be discovered about the evangelist within the bounds of reasonable probability, it remains to sum up the conclusions. The evangelist was a scribe, occupying an official position in the church of which he was so sympathetic a member. He was thoroughly acquainted with its traditions and outlook, and possessed gifts of style and composition which, while they were unobtrusive, produced the liturgical Gospel of all time. Probably he did this with official encouragement and support, his ascription of his work to St. Matthew likewise having the approval of the authorities. This would be in keeping with the general lack of ostentation which he showed in going about his work.

IX

CONCLUSION

OUR inquiry having now come to a close, it is possible to review its method and results. In seeking to investigate the origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, we tried to enlarge the scope of treatment by reference to three forces in its composition, the material, the circumstances, and the author. First the material was examined and from this examination certain conclusions were reached about the sources. In particular it was argued that M was a written document supplying the bulk of the peculiar discourse material and that the peculiar narratives were first put into writing by the author himself. Another conclusion, quite as important as these, was that many facts revealed by the source analysis could not be explained by it. This led us to look for an explanation in the second component of the Gospel, the circumstances of its production. Here we found grounds for suspecting that the liturgical background itself provided the reason for some of these facts, that it served as a focus or channel whereby other elements in the circumstances had their effect on the book, and that the author wrote with the purpose of composing a comprehensive and suitable gospel book for the liturgy and exposition of the church. Next the Jewish character of the community and its relation to Rabbinical Judaism were surveyed, a survey which suggested that the book was written in closest contact with and opposition to Pharisaism not earlier than A.D. 90. This was followed by a general picture of the community in which the book appeared, and it was inferred that the evidence as a whole pointed to a Phoenician port at the end of the first century. Finally, the contribution of the evangelist was summarized, and a discussion of the question of authorship indicated that the writer was a scribe and his book an official undertaking, deliberately produced as a pseudonymous work with the approval of the authorities in the community. These last chapters, as much as the liturgical ones, provided explanations of characteristics of the book which the documentary hypothesis alone failed to account for. These suggestions about the designs of the book were reached by trying to explain its features as the result of the facts mentioned. The origins of the book provided the limit of the inquiry, and problems, which for their own sake might be investigated further, were

dropped as soon as this limit was passed. This will explain why the historical value of the Nativity stories, for example, was not further discussed.

There is another question for inquiry, that of scope. Is the three-fold analysis of the causes which brought the book into being a satisfactory one? A recent article by F. V. Filson, 'Five Factors in the Production of the Gospels',¹ suggests that these factors are

- (1) the personality of the Evangelist,
- (2) the written sources,
- (3) the influence of environment,
- (4) the adjustment to the Gentile setting,
- (5) the present stimulus of the historic Jesus.

In our inquiry factors (3) and (4) have been treated as one, that of circumstances, while factor (5) has been taken for granted. This last procedure may need defence. It is readily admitted that without an *evagγέλιον* in the Pauline sense of the word there would have been no Gospels at all. The religious and theological content of Christianity enabled them to be written. On the other hand, this element is to be treated as a factor in the origin of the Gospel as a particular type of book, and in research into our Gospel it may be taken for granted, just as Q and Mark are taken for granted in the documentary sphere. Where religious beliefs are relevant they are discussed in connexion with the factor to which they attach, be it community or evangelist. Consequently while *evagγέλιον* is of the first importance for the discussion of the origins of Mark, it is past history when Matthew is investigated. Hence, while we must take into account Professor Filson's factor (5) or something like it, in treating of the origin of the Gospels taken together or of the earliest one in particular, we may feel justified when we discuss Matthew, not in neglecting it, but in assuming it in the same way that we assume Mark.

This point of view does not involve an undervaluation of Mark or the debt of Matthew to it. The later Gospel owes more to the earlier than to all the other sources put together, and despite all additions and modifications, is recognizably the same kind of book, so much so indeed that Matthew has been described with justification as a revised edition of Mark. The revision, if so we may describe it, was carried out so successfully that the Gospel, itself the most used of the four, has had no successors.

¹ *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, ix. 98–103. As I have not been able to see the article, this summary is from *New Testament Literature* in 194x, p. 26 f.

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

MATTHEW	MATTHEW
i-ii 93, 135	v. 7 16 (2), 17 (2)
i. i 52	8 f. 16, 17
8 52	8 16
ii 52	9 17
i2-i5 52	10-12 16, 17, 25
i3-i5 52	10 16, 17 (2), 24, 35
i6 52	ii f. 15, 16, 17
i8-25 52	ii 16 (2), 121
i8 52	12 16 (2)
21 . . . 53, 54, 57 (3), 93, 105, 107	13-16 17, 127
22 93	13 17 (3), 102
23 . . . 53, 54, 57 (3), 93, 105	14 17 (4), 24, 35
ii 53, 54, 120	15 17
i 54	16 f. 35
5 53	16 17 (3), 24, 25, 26, 98
6 54 (2), 57 (3)	v. 17-vi. 18 25 (2), 26, 27, 36
ii 22, 125	v. 17-20 17, 76
i5 54, 57 (3), 107	17 17 (2), 18 (4), 24, 26
i8 15, 54, 57 (3)	18 17, 18, 21, 102, 104
23 54 (3), 57 (3), 124	19 f. 17, 18, 24, 25 (2), 26 (3), 35
iii-xxv 108, 135, 136	19 18 (2), 25
iii-iv 135	20 23, 25, 121
iii. i-i2. 10	21-6 18
i-6 107	21-4 24, 35
2. 90 (2), 92	21-3 18
4. 39, 107	21 f. 18 (2), 26, 84
7-10. 85	21 18
7. 75, 85, 92, 121	22 18, 23, 25, 98
10 85, 92 (2)	23 f. 18 (3), 25, 26, 35, 84
14 f. 37, 50, 96, 107	25 f. 18
14 50	26 125
16 39	27-30 18
17 107	27 f. 18, 24, 26, 35, 84
iv. 5. 47, 124	27 26
12-17 82	29 f. 18, 84
12 82 (3), 89, 93	29 19, 84 (7), 85
13-16 50, 96	30 18, 84
13 82 (4), 93, 94	31 f. 19, 85 (2)
14-16 57, 93	32 85 (3), 92 (4), 102
14 57	33-7 19, 24, 31, 35
15 f. 57	33 f. 26
15 118 (2)	33 20, 26, 57
17 76, 90 (3), 92	34-6 20 (2), 26, 31, 98
23-5. 50	34 f. 20, 21, 25
23 . . . 37, 76, 89 (2), 92, 110 (2)	34 19, 20, 91, 92
24 131	35 20, 124
v-xxv 8, 14 (3)	36 31, 35
v-vii 14, 26 (2), 34, 135	37 19, 20, 26
v. i f. 15 (2)	38-42 20, 25, 75
3 f. 17	38-41 24, 26, 35
3 15 (2), 16 (2), 25	38 20, 26
4 f. 26	39 19, 20, 102
4 15, 16, 35	40 20
5 16 (2), 17 (3), 24	41 20 (2), 25, 26
6 15 (2), 16, 17	42 44
7-10 16	43-8 20
7-9 17, 24, 26, 35	44 16

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

MATTHEW	MATTHEW
v. 46 f.	117
47	117
48	16, 25
vi. 1-18.	20, 97, 106, 130
1-8	21, 24, 35
1-6	26 (2)
1.	20, 25
2-4	20, 97
2 f.	22
2.	110, 111
5-8	20
5-7	97
5.	110, 111
7 f.	21, 25, 26, 35
7.	117
9-13.	20, 97, 126
9.	21
10	21
13	21, 75
14 f.	20, 97 (2)
16-18	20, 24, 26, 97
16	22
17	46
18	17
19-21	9, 22, 25, 75
19 f.	21, 22
19	21, 22
20	22
21	22
25-34	77
30	40
32	118
33	16
34	22, 24, 35
vii.	85
vii. 1-5	76
1	76
6	22, 24, 35, 76
9	27
12	18, 22
13 f.	22, 24, 25, 26, 35, 75
13	23 (2)
14	23
15	22, 24, 35, 126, 127
16-20	85
16-19	85, 92 (2)
16-18	85 (3)
16	74, 85 (4)
17	85 (3)
18	85 (2)
19	85 (2)
20	74, 85 (3)
21-3	23, 25, 75
21	22, 23 (2)
22 f.	127
22	23
23	24 (2), 57, 127
24	39
28	41, 75
29	III
viii.-xiii	136
viii.-ix	89, 135
viii. 1-4	118
5-13	30, 118
11 f.	75
12	116
14-17	120
15	38, 57 (3), 94
17	89
18-22	73
18	131
23-7	124
24	41
25	40
26	40, 132
32	124
33	124
34	124 (2)
ix. 1.	124
2.	107
4.	21
9-13.	117
9.	7, 138 (5), 139
II	80
I3	27, 90 (2), 92 (2), 94, 117, 121
18-26	73
27-31	89 (3), 90 (2), 92
32 f.	90 (3), 92 (2)
34	110
ix. 35-xi. I	79 (2)
ix. 35-x. 33	119
ix. 35	37, 89 (2), 92, 110 (2) 124
37 f.	79
x-xi. I	135
x	26, 32, 79, 86 (2)
x. 3	138 (4), 139
5 f.	26, 27, 35
5	118 (2), 119, 121
6	26, 27, 50
8	26, 27, 35
9	125 (3)
II	124
14	79
15	86 (2), 92
16	26, 27, 35, 98
17-22	33, 86
17-19	121
17	31, 86, 91, 110 (2), 122
18 f.	119
18	118
22	86 (2), 92
23	16, 26, 27, 31, 35, 107, 118 (2), 119 (2), 122, 125
24 f.	26, 27 (2), 35
25	26, 27, 35, 79
27	79
34	18
35 f.	57
38	86 (2), 92
39	87 (3), 92
40-2	91 (2), 98 (2)
40 f.	79
40	26, 91, 92

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

145

MATTHEW

x.	41	.	.	.	26, 27, 35, 126
	42	.	.	.	29, 91
xi-xii.	27
xi.	86 (3)
xi. i	75
xi. 2-xii.	136
5	125
10	57
13	18
14	.	.	.	27 (2), 107	
15	.	.	.	83, 91 (2), 92	
17	15
18 f.	30
18	30
19	117 (2)
20-4.	75, 86 (2)
24	92
25-7.	27 (2)
25	21
27	91, 107
28-30	.	.	27 (4), 35, 98, 108	.	106
xii.	116
xii. i-8.	106, 116
1	74, 110
2	.	.	.	27 (2), 97, 116	
5-7.	35
5 f.	106
6	116
7	.	27, 35, 90 (2), 92 (2), 94, 121	.	.	94
9	.	.	.	110 (2)	94 (2)
10	74 (2)
11 f.	.	27 (2), 97, 116 (2)	.	.	27, 106
11	94 (2), 118 (2)
15 f.	94
17-21	.	.	.	57, 94 (2)	57, 94 (2)
18-20	.	.	.	57, 94 (3)	57, 94 (3)
18	.	.	.	57, 118 (2)	57, 118 (2)
21	.	.	94 (2), 118 (2)	.	94 (2), 118 (2)
22-32	.	.	.	10	10
22-4	.	.	90 (2), 92 (2)	.	90 (2), 92 (2)
24	.	.	121	.	121
33-5	.	.	85 (2), 92 (2)	.	85 (2), 92 (2)
33	.	.	85 (2)	.	85 (2)
34 f.	.	.	85	.	85
34	.	21, 75, 85, 121	.	.	21, 75, 85, 121
35	.	.	22	.	22
36 f.	.	27 (2), 35	.	.	27 (2), 35
38-42	.	.	87, 97	.	87, 97
38 f.	.	.	90, 92	.	90, 92
38	.	121 (2)	.	.	121 (2)
39	.	.	87 (3), 92	.	87 (3), 92
40	.	.	9	.	9
45	.	.	21, 76	.	21, 76
50	.	.	23	.	23
xiii.	.	.	28, 34, 97	.	28, 34, 97
xiii. i-52	.	.	136	.	136
9	.	.	83, 91 (2), 92	.	83, 91 (2), 92
10	.	.	74 (3)	.	74 (3)
12	.	76, 87 (2), 92 (3)	.	.	76, 87 (2), 92 (3)
13	.	.	74	.	74
19	.	.	21	.	21

MATTHEW

xiii.	24-30	.	.	.	28 (2), 35, 97
	24	.	.	.	34, 76
	31 i.	.	.	.	10
	31	.	.	.	34
	33	.	.	.	34
	35	.	.	.	57 (3), 94
	36-52	.	.	.	28, 35
	36-43	.	.	.	28, 97, 127
	38	.	.	.	21
	41	.	.	.	107, 127
	42	.	.	.	75
	43	.	.	.	83, 91 (2), 92
	44	.	.	.	22, 34
	45	.	.	.	34
	47-50	.	.	.	34, 127
	47 f.	.	.	.	97
	47	.	.	.	34
	49 f.	.	.	.	28, 97
	49	.	.	.	21
	50	.	.	.	75
	52	.	.	22, 106, 111, 126	136
xiii.	53-xvii.	21	.	.	136
	53	.	.	.	75
	54-8	.	.	.	73
	54	.	.	.	110 (2)
	55	.	.	.	82
	56	.	.	.	76
xiv-xvii.	28
xiv. i-12	120
	3-5	.	.	.	73
	6-12	.	.	.	73
	7	.	.	.	24
	9	.	.	.	40
	13-21	.	.	.	73, 74
	16	.	.	.	74
	18	.	.	.	74 (2)
	19	.	.	.	40
	28-31	.	37, 40, 43 (3), 44, 82, 95	.	37, 40, 43 (3), 44, 82, 95
	28 f.	.	.	.	40
	28	.	.	.	132
	29	.	.	.	132
	34-6	.	.	.	73
xv. i-20	.	.	.	108, 121	108, 121
i f.	102
2	46
9	80
12-14	.	.	28, 97, 108, 121	.	28, 97, 108, 121
12 f.	35
14	27, 31
15	.	37, 38, 39, 43, 74 (2)	.	.	37, 38, 39, 43, 74 (2)
19	.	.	38, 98, 121	.	38, 98, 121
21-8	118
22-5	97
22-4	37, 50, 118
22	.	.	50, 132 (2), 133	.	50, 132 (2), 133
23	50, 119
24	26, 27, 50
25-8	119
26	19
xvi. i-3	92 (2)
i f.	90 (2)
4	.	.	.	87 (4), 92	87 (4), 92

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

147

MATTHEW	MATTHEW
xxi. 28-31 30 31 f. 117 (2) 31 23 32 30 33-46 118 35 74, 122 41 98, 118 43 30, 98, 118 (2) 45 98 xxii. 1-14 10 (2), 30, 33, 35, 82 1-10 6 1 f. 10 1 30 2-10 30, 97 2 30 (2), 34, 35, 82 6 f. 10, 30 6 122 7 6, 82, 124 10 21, 30 (2) 11-14 10, 30 (2), 35 11-13 82, 106 13 75, 82 14 83 17 74 18 76 19 125 23-32 120 23 120 (2) 34 120 37 56 40 18 41-6 107 xxiii.-xxv 136 xxiii. 30, 32, 75, 89 xxiii. 1-36 106 2 f. 30, 31 (2), 35, 121 3 108 5 30, 31 (3), 35 6 110, 111 7-10 30, 31 (2), 32, 35 8 126 9 21 10 31, 126 11 88 (3), 89, 92 13 31 (2) 15-22 30, 31, 35 15 31 (2), 32 16-22 20, 31 16 31, 125 17 125 22 19, 91, 92 23 31 (2) 24 30, 35 25 f. 31, 32 25 30 (2), 31 26 30 (3), 31, 35 27 f. 30, 31 27 31, 35 28 31, 127 29-32 31, 32 29 31 (3), 110 30 31 (2)	xxiii. 31 31 (2) 32 31 (2), 32 33 75 34 16 (2), 31, 32, 110 (3), 111, 122 (3), 125, 126 (3) xxiv 32 xxiv. 5 127 7 118, 131 9 86 (3), 91, 92, 118 10-12 32 (2), 86 10 121 11 24, 29, 126, 127 12 127 (2) 13 86 (3), 92 14 98, 118 (2) 15 125 20 102, 116 23 91, 92 24 29 26 91, 92 31 107 35 21 36 89 37-41 89 42 89 (2), 92 43-51 89 43 22 51 75 xxv. 1-13 32, 76 1-12 89 1-10 35 I 34 10 22, 32 II-13 23, 76 II f. 32 13 32, 89 (2), 92, 98 14-30 32, 125 29 87 (2), 92 30 75 31-46 32, 97, 98, 127 (2) 31-45 35 31 107 (2) 32 118 xxvi. I 75 4 19 8 23 15 46, 81, 96, 125 16 19, 125 17-19 73 18 124 25 37, 44 26 77 27 77 28 107, 126 32 49 33 24 39 51 42 21 44 37 52-4 37, 44 52 f. 44 52 44 (2), 49

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

	MATTHEW	MARK
xxvi. 53	44	i. 16-20
54	44	21
56	52	22
75	15	23-8
xxvii. 3-10	37, 44, 46, 81, 96 (3), 104, 128	23
3	81	i. 29-vi. 13
5	81, 104	i. 29-vi. 11
6	81, 104	i. 29-34
7	81, 104	29
8	104	33
9 f.	45, 57 (2), 81 (2), 94	34
9	45, 57	39
10	104	40-4
19	37, 46, 96	41
24 f.	37, 46, 96	43
25	47 (2)	45
29	19	ii. 5
33	105	14
43	21, 38	23-8
46	104 (2), 105	23
51-4	47, 96	27
51-3	37	iii. i.
51	132	6
53	124	7-12.
54	132	7 f.
58	40	9.
59	19	10
62-6	37, 47, 48, 96	16
63	111	17
64	41, 76	18
xxviii.	129	22-9.
xxviii. 2-4	37, 47, 48 (3), 96	35
2	132	iv
4	132	iv. 3-9
5	49	9.
7	43, 49 (2), 91 (2), 92 (2)	10 f.
8	49	13-20
9-20	37, 48, 91	21
9 f.	48 (3), 49, 96	23
9	48, 49	25
10	49, 91 (2), 92 (2)	26-9.
11-15	47, 48, 96	30-2.
11	124	30
13	47	35-41
15	96	38
16-20	48 (3), 49, 96	39
16	49	40
17	40, 49	v. 4 f.
18-20	49	5
18	21, 91	8-10
19	107, 118, 128	9
		14
		15
		16
		18-20
i-xiii	135	73, 75
i. 1-15	135	30-3
4	90, 107	35 f.
6	39, 107	38
ii	107	39
i4 f.	90, 93 (2)	41
i4	76, 82 (2)	vi. i-6

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

149

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

	LUKE		LUKE
i. 74	21	xii. 42	31
77	54	47	31
ii. 22	44	48	31
iii. 7.	75, 121	49	16
9.	85	52	31
iv. 14	82	xii. 12	80
15	110	21	22
16-30	60, 73, 82	28	40
16	50, 82	33 f.	9, 75
22	82	33	22 (2)
v. 1-11	40	34	22
vi. 20-49	15	39	22
20	15 (2), 125	57-9	18
21	15 (2)	xiii. 15	23, 27
22 f.	16	16	27
22	121	18 f.	10, 32
25	15 (3)	18	34
27 f.	20	20 f.	33
29 f.	20, 75	20	34
29	19, 102	22	80
32-6.	20	23 f.	22
32	117	23	22, 75
36	16	25	23, 24, 32
39	27	26 f.	23, 75
40	26	26	80
43-5.	85	27	23, 24 (2)
43 f.	85	28	75
43	85	30	88 (2)
44	85	xiv. 4	116
45	22, 85	5	27 (4)
46	23, 75	15-24	30
vii. 12	23	16-24	6, 10, 30, 83, 97
22	125	19	27
29 f.	30	21	125
32	15	26 f.	75
viii. 8	91	27	86, 87
16	17	34 f.	17
18	87 (2)	34	102
29	29	35	91
30	44	xv. 3-7	28
ix. 23	86 (2)	4-6	29
24	87 (2)	7	29 (3)
x	86	xvi. 17	17, 21, 102
x. 12-15	86	18	19, 85 (2)
12	86	xvii. 3 f.	29, 38, 91
13-15	75	6	87
21	21	23	16, 91
xi. 1.	80	33	87 (3)
2-4	21	34 f.	87
4	75	xix. 10	28
II	27	11-27	125
14-23	10	12	32
14 f.	90 (2)	14	32
16	90 (2)	26	87 (2)
26	76	27	32
29-32	87	39 f.	51
29	87 (3), 90, 121	46	118
30	9	xx. 27	120
33	17	xxi. 8	28
39-52	88	xxii. 12	16
40 f.	30	xxii. 26	88 (3)
41	22, 30	42	21

INDEX I. REFERENCES TO THE GOSPELS

151

	LUKE		JOHN
xxiii. 14	44	xii. 12-16	66
xxiv. 34	43	14 f.	94
47-9	49	15	69
		42	109, 115
		xv. 18-25	115
		xvi. 1-4	115
		2	109, 115 (2)
v. 10-12	115	xvii. 12	23
16-18	115	xviii. 11	44
17 f.	115	20	110
32-5	115	36	22
59	110	xix. 7	115
vii. 19	115	xx. 21-3	49
22-4	115 (2)	23	28, 40, 91
37-9	115	xxi.	40, 49
52	54	xxi. 1-3	43
vii. 53-viii. 11	69	7 f.	41
ix. 14-39	115	15-17	49
22	109, 115		

INDEX II SUBJECT INDEX

- 'am ha'arez, 117.
 author, 3, ch. iii *passim*.
 beatitudes, 15-17, 24.
 Birkath ha-Minim, 109-11, 128.
 canon, 4.
 church, 38 f., 43, 79, ch. vii *passim*.
 circumcision, 115 f.
 confiaiton, 10, 17 f., 20, 22 f.
 date, 3, 5 f., 127-31.
 duplicates, 16 f., 84-93.
 episcopacy, 126.
 form criticism, 2, 66-8.
 formulae, 32-4, 75 f.
 geography, 124, 131-3.
 Haggadah, 61, 98.
 Halakah, 61, 98, 108.
 Herodians, 106, 120.
 Jamnia, 103, 107, 114.
 John Baptist, 107.
 law, 18, 107-9, 116, 129 f.
 lectionary system, ch. iv *passim*.
 liturgy, ch. iv-v *passim*.
 M, 3, 13, 14-36, 38 f., 70.
 Mark, 3, 6, 8-14, 70.
 Messiah, 107.
 Minim, 112-13, 120.
 missionary outlook, 117-19.

- modification (editorial), 2, chs. ii-iii *passim*.
 N, 13, 37, 57 f.
 Nativity stories, 37, 51-5.
 Papias, 3-5.
 parables, 28, 30, 32-5, 97 f.
 Passion stories, 11, 37, 44-7, 67, 95 f.
 persecution, 16, 109-12, 115, 121 f.
 Petrine stories, 37-44, 95 f.
 Pharisees, 36, 106, 113, 120 f.
 prophets, 126.
 Q, 3 f. chs. ii-iii *passim*, 70.
 quotations, 37, 39, 45 f., 51 f., 53 f., 55-7, 81, 93-5.
 Resurrection stories, 37, 40 f., 43, 47-50, 95 f.
 Roman empire, 42, 82, 129.
 S, 12 f.
 Sabbath, 116.
 Sadducees, 113, 120 f.
 sermons, chs. iv-v *passim*.
 Targum, 5, 54, 60, 62.
 testimonies, 4, 66.
 textual criticism, 15, 16, 19, 21-4, 39, 52, 69, 73, 80, 82, 84, 87, 90, 104 f., 107, 110, 119, 124 f., 127, 131.
 wealth, 125 f.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

